GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy
Program
LEA Grant Application
System Cover Sheet

Please return to: Georgia Dept. of Education Attn: 205 Jessie Hill Jr. Dr 1758 Twin Towers East Atlanta, GA 30344	DOE Use Only Date and Time Received:	DOE Use Only: Received By:
Name of Applicant: Clarke County School District		**Project Number:** (DOE Assigned)

System Contact Information:

Total Grant Request: $3,316,782	**Name:** Dr. Mark Tavernier	**Position:** Director of Teaching and Learning
Number of schools in system: applying: 10	**Phone:** 706-546-7721	**Fax:** 706-549-0555
Congressional District:	**Email:** tavernierm@clarke.k12.ga.us	

Sub-grant Status

_____ Large District (45,000 or more students)

X_ Mid-Sized District (10,000 to 44,999 students)

_____ Small District (0-9,999 students)

Check the one category that best describes your official fiscal agency:

STRIVING READERS

Clarke County School District's Grant Proposal

I. ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENT AND TEACHER DATA

a. CRCT Data: *Norm-Referenced Test:* Along with the state's Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) assessments, the Clarke County School District (CCSD) also administers the Scantron Performance Series Norm-Referenced Test each year, an assessment that, when compared to CRCT scores (Table 2), provides a better yardstick to determine how Clarke County students measure up to students across the nation. With the 50th percentile representing the *average* student performance level, CCSD's third-grade students combined scored at the 34th percentile in reading, fifth-grade students

scored at the 40th percentile, and eighth-grade students scored at the 39th percentile—all significantly

below average. Percentile results for the four target elementary schools and target middle school are

shown in Table 1:

Table 1: Nationally Norm-Referenced Reading & ELA Performance Results 2011		
Schools	**Reading Percentile Scores**	**Language Arts Percentile Scores**
Fowler Drive Elementary School	34	31
J.J. Harris Elementary Charter School	40	33
H.B. Stroud Elementary School	44	35
Winterville Road Elementary School	35	23
Coile Middle School	47	47

Because the norm-referenced test compares Clarke County students to students nationwide, the gaps

identified in Table I are alarming.

State Writing Test: On Georgia's 2011 Fifth-Grade Writing Assessment, the percentages of students

NOT meeting standards in all four target elementary schools—Fowler Drive Elementary (22%), J.J. Harris

Elementary (32%), Stroud Elementary (43%), and Winterville Elementary (31%)—are too high, despite

the fact that the schools had significantly improved their writing scores last year as compared to the

year before (by 22%, 27%, 22%, and 28%, respectively). Nevertheless, these scores are all still higher

than the state's "Does Not Meet" (DNM) average of 21%. Although fifth-grade writing test results have

improved over the past five years, too many Clarke County students are entering middle school with

significant writing deficits. On the 2011 Eighth-Grade Writing Assessment, improvements were far less

dramatic, but Coile Middle School had the highest DNM score at 34%, as compared to the state average

of 18%. At Coile Middle School, 19.9% of students are enrolled in the Remedial Education Program, and

13.2% are enrolled in special education.

CRCTs in Reading and Language Arts: Table 2 presents the assessment results for all Clarke County students in grades 3, 5, and 8 who did <u>NOT</u> meet standards on the 2011 CRCTs in Reading and Language Arts:

Table 2: 2011 CRCT Results in Reading and Language Arts – Grades 3, 5, and 8[1]						
Schools	**% Reading DNM**			**% Language Arts DNM**		
Grades	**3**	**5**	**8**	**3**	**5**	**8**
Alps Road ES & Clarke MS	20.0	25.0	8.1	23.6	18.8	14.9
Barnett Shoals & Hilsman MS	16.2	8.1	5.3	22.1	4.2	10.3
Barrow ES & Clarke MS	7.4	9.6	8.1	10.3	1.9	14.9
Chase Street & Clarke MS	9.4	15.8	8.1	9.4	5.3	14.9
Cleveland Road & BHL MS	12.7	3.8	5.3	16.4	7.5	16.0
Fowler Drive & Coile MS	16.3	9.3	10.3	20.4	3.7	11.4
Gaines ES & Hilsman MS	25.6	10.3	5.3	29.5	13.8	10.3
Harris Charter ES & Coile MS	15.1	18.2	10.3	8.2	14.3	11.4
Oglethorpe ES & BHL MS	15.6	15.5	5.3	20.8	13.1	16.0
Stroud ES & Coile MS	13.0	11.1	10.3	24.1	13.9	11.4
Timothy Road ES & Clarke MS	3.1	11.5	8.1	12.5	7.7	14.9
Whit Davis ES & Hilsman MS	12.0	7.8	5.3	14.1	4.9	10.3
Whitehead Road & BHL MS	6.7	15.2	5.3	9.6	12.1	16.0
Winterville ES & Coile MS	22.0	26.4	10.3	28.8	14.8	11.4

A CRCT Reading Domain Analysis reveals that the percentage of items correct in the Literacy Comprehension Domain was 68% for third-grade students and 67% for fifth-grade students. Furthermore, the percentage of items correct for Reading Skills and Vocabulary Domain was 78% for third-grade students and 79% for fifth-grade students. The district's CRCT ELA Domain Analysis reveals that the percentage of items correct for third-grade students was 68% and 69% for fifth graders in the Grammar & Sentence Construction Domain, while in the Research & Writing Process Domain the number of correct items for third graders was 62% and 76% for fifth-grade students. In the Reading Skills & Vocabulary Acquisition Domain, the number of correct items was 75% for fifth-graders. For the Grammar & Sentence Construction and Research & Writing Process Domains, Coile Middle School is the

---

[1] Shaded rows indicate schools targeted for CCSD's Striving Readers project.

district's lowest scoring middle school.[2] At a time when the English/Language Arts Common Core

Georgia Performance Standards are being implemented in Georgia, our schools need to prepare

students for the increased rigor of the new state standards by identifying each student's skill deficits,

designing targeted intervention plans (RTI), and monitoring each student's progress as they master the

reading skills necessary for reading competency at or above their current grade levels. For disaggregated

CRCT results, see Table 7.

High School Reading and Writing Tests: CCSD does not currently determine Lexile scores for high

school students, but will do so using the Scholastic Reading Inventory with Striving Readers grant

funding. English Language Arts and Writing scores are shown below:

Table 3: Graduation Test Domain Analysis – Meets English Language Arts Standards - 2011			
	Reading Comprehen.	**Literary Analysis**	**Conventions/Writing**
Georgia	76	74	82
CCSD	70	69	76
Cedar Shoals HS	69	68	75

Table 4: Comparison of 2011 Georgia High School Writing Test Pass Results				
Students Tested	**Ideas**	**Organization**	**Style**	**Conventions**
Cedar Shoals High School	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8
CCSD (3 high schools)	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9
Georgia	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2

b. High School Graduation Data:[3]

---

[2] This data represents scores prior to summer retests.
[3] CCSD's third high school, Classic City High School, is a small (125 students), alternative, self-paced high school.

Table 5: CCSD's Graduation Data over the Past Five Years					
	2007	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**
Cedar Shoals High School	58.1	62.2	61.4	70.4	71.7
Clarke Central High School	63.6	69.3	68.7	71.4	74.1
CCSD Graduation Rates	58.4	63.1	63.3	70.1	70.8
CCSD Targets	65.0	70.0	75.0	80.0	85.0
State of Georgia Graduation Rate	72.3	75.4	78.9	80.8	Not avail.

c. **Early Learning Readiness:** CCSD's Office of Early Learning (Early Head Start, Head

Start, Pre-K, and Early Reading First) administers the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-IV) twice a

year, in fall and spring, to children ages 3-5. For three-year-olds, the fall 2010 administration revealed

that only 45% of students were on target for language development, while the spring 2011

administration demonstrated that 70% of students were on track—a growth factor of 25 percentage

points. In the fall of 2010, 42% of children entered Clarke County's Pre-K program with significant

language delays. While 58% of Pre-K students demonstrated age-appropriate language development in

the fall, 81% of students did so in the spring—a growth rate of 23 percentage points, indicating that 81%

of our Pre-K students were ready for kindergarten by the end of the school year.

The results of the 2011 Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS)

assessment, shown in Table 6 below, reveal that for Clarke County kindergarten students, the

English/Language Arts scores across the district are slightly better than the state average;

however, the percentage of students with *low motivation to learn* ("Approaches to Learning") is

significantly worse than the state average, especially in two of the target elementary schools,

Stroud and Winterville; target schools are shaded:

Table 6: 2011 GKIDS Results for ELA and Motivation to Learn - % NOT Meeting Standards					
Schools	**ELA**	**Motivation to Learn**	**Schools**	**ELA**	**Motivation to Learn**
Alps Road ES	15.00	33.20	J.J. Harris (C)ES	11.80	15.30
Barnett Shoals ES	11.00	36.90	Oglethorpe ES	31.20	22.40

Barrow ES	13.30	19.50	Stroud ES	19.40	52.00
Chase Street ES	12.80	15.90	Timothy Rd. ES	21.30	41.60
Cleveland Road ES	11.40	18.10	Whit Davis ES	13.40	18.60
Fowler Drive ES	12.30	10.20	Whitehead ES	18.00	28.40
Gaines ES	20.40	37.50	Winterville ES	8.90	40.80
CCSD	16.40	28.50	State of Georgia	18.6	23.70

Clarke County teachers are challenged not only to teach the standards-based curriculum at each grade level but also to draw out of children their natural curiosity to learn and grow academ-ically. Motivation to learn can be a greater predictor of school success than assessment results.

d. Disaggregation of Data in Subgroups: For the 2011-2012 school year, CCSD's federal lunch-program rate is 79.03% (Absolute Priority and Competitive Priority). Table 7 presents CRCT Data for Clarke County subgroups:

Table 7: Disaggregated CRCT Data Grades 3, 5, and 8 – % NOT Meeting Standards						
	% Reading DNM			% Language Arts DNM		
Grades	3	5	8	3	5	8
All Students 2010/2011	37/28	45/34	39/28	56/36	43/32	56/40
Asian Students 2010/2011	0/5	5/5	0/9	6/11	5/11	0/9
Black Students 2010/2011	18/20	21/17	13/9	27/24	17/13	23/16
Hispanic Students 2010/2011	9/8	15/13	6/8	14/14	18/8	16/13
White Students 2010/2011	4/2	8/5	5/1	7/3	5/3	7/2
Economically Disadvantaged 2010/2011	10.00/ 16.33	11.00/ 16.10	9.00/ 8.03	17.00/ 20.39	17.00/ 10.04	21.00/ 14.88
Students with Disabilities 2010/2011	27.00/ 26.50	30.00/ 34.54	32.00/ 32.60	53.00/ 34.49	43.00/ 33.14	55.00/ 41.75
Limited English Proficient 2010/2011	8.00/ 20.55	15.00/ 14.67	10.00/ 24.10	19.00/ 25.11	30.00/ 19.94	31.00/ 35.75

e. Teacher Retention Data: CCSD has 1,150 teachers and typically hires about 100 teachers every year. The current turnover rate for Clarke County teachers is 9.47% with 109 teachers resigning by the end of the 2010-2011 school year. Last summer (2011), CCSD had 99 positions posted for certified teachers. Each year, the school district fills about 30% of its open teacher positions from the pool of new University of Georgia College of Education graduates.

f. Teacher Participation in Professional Learning Communities or Ongoing Profess-

ional Learning at the School: See school proposals.

<div style="background:black; color:white; text-align:center; padding:4px;">

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

</div>

Clarke County's Striving Readers needs-assessment process involved brainstorming sessions;

compiling and examining student literacy-assessment data and districtwide survey data; determining the

needs of the teachers; and exploring the capacity and readiness of schools to implement Striving

Readers with fidelity (implementing, monitoring, collecting and reporting data). As a result of the needs

assessment, the cluster identified for the Striving Readers grant is the Cedar Shoals High School/Coile

Middle School cluster, including the four feeder elementary schools and the district's Early Learning

Center.

a. Description of the Materials Used in the Needs Assessment:

Table 8: Materials Used for Needs Assessment	
CCSD Materials	**Contribution to Comprehensive Needs Assessment**
CCSD's annual "School Improvement Survey"	This survey is designed to gather perception data related to each school's implementation of various components of the *Georgia School Keys*.
Annual District Data Notebook	This notebook summarizes current and longitudinal school and district performance results of all national, state, and district assessments.
"Comprehensive District-wide Assessment Plan"	*Assessment Strand - Georgia School Keys*; Assessment Pyramid; list of K-12 district assessments; "Elementary Reading Levels Correlations"; "District Expectations for Using Data Teams"
"Amended AYP Tracking Charts"	"Grades 3-8 AYP Progress in CRCT Reading/English Language Arts"; "AYP Progress in GHSGT English Language Arts"; "AYP Progress in Graduation Rate"
"Literacy Assessment Results"	"Percentage of Students at or above Benchmark Reading Level" (by quarters); list of students' reading levels in grades 1, 2, & 3, assessments in spelling, writing, sight words; "Percentage of Students at or above Benchmark Reading Level After Quarter 4"; writing scores
"Preliminary State Assessment Results"	"Historical Data"; "Performance Level Information"; "Subgroup Data"; "Benchmark Data"; "Domain Data"; "GKIDS Data"; "GAA Data"; "ACCESS Results"; "Writing Test Data"; "EOCT"; "Scantron Predictability Study"; "State/RESA/District Comparison"; "Literacy Assessments & CRCT Comparison"; "Cohort Analysis"; "AYP Tracking Charts"; "District School Improvement Survey Data"
CCSD's District	District goals, initiatives, action steps, timelines

Improvement Plan	
School Improvement Plans	Each school's primary literacy focus and efforts.

b. Description of the Needs Assessment: CCSD is a data-rich school district; therefore, identifying a school cluster to participate in a Striving Readers grant was based on historical and recent student-achievement data; AYP trends; SES-usage; the schools' capacity to implement a rigorous Striving Readers grant with fidelity; and the ability to collect evaluation data over the next five years. In November, district administrators collected assessment data related to reading, language arts, graduation rate, and other indicators. The data revealed that the Coile Middle School quadrant of Clarke County (Cedar Shoals High School, Coile Middle School, and the four feeder elementary schools) would be the best placement for a state Striving Readers grant, based on student achievement data, capacity to implement the grant, and individuals located within that quadrant; Deborah Haney, Principal of Winterville Elementary School, for example, is on the Georgia Department of Education's Literacy Team, and Dwight Manzy, Principal of Coile Middle School, implemented the district's only Reading First grant at an elementary school. In addition, CCSD's centrally located Early Learning Center, which serves children from birth to five years of age, is included in the proposed implementation plan because the Center serves all Clarke County schools. Carolyn Wolpert, the district's Early Reading First Coordinator, and Linda Sprague, the Early Learning Center's Professional Learning Coordinator, both serve on Georgia's Literacy Task Force. Based on the needs identified, the Professional Learning Plan (see pp. 19-20) was developed, highlighting examination of assessment data, targeted RTI, reading endorsements, and writing. On November 15, the Striving Readers grant program was explained to principals and district leaders. On November 22, the principals of the 7 target schools met with district leaders, including Superintendent Philip Lanoue, to discuss the

requirements of the Striving Readers grant program related to needs assessment, identification of gaps in each school's literacy practices, and proposal writing. Following that meeting, each school formed literacy teams that examined school-specific, relevant student-assessment to determine each school's literacy plan. CCSD conducts a "School Improvement Survey" in the spring of each school year in every school to gather perception data regarding each school's implementation of various components of the *Georgia School Keys*. Each school's certified staff, parents, and students participate in this online survey. In the target Cedar/Coile cluster, the following results indicate a need for additional professional learning in these areas:

(1) The principal and other leaders plan adult learning by utilizing data: Fowler, 46.43%; Harris,19.30%; Stroud, 13.95%; Winterville, 11.11%; Coile, 27.27%; Cedar, 42.11%.
(2) (2) Teams meet to review and study current research to make informed instructional decisions: Fowler, 46.43%; Harris, 21.05%; Stroud, 30.23%; Winterville - 11.11%; Coile, 30.91%; Cedar, 40.58%.
(3) (3): The staff participates in long-term, in-depth professional learning that is aligned with our school: Fowler, 42.86%; Harris, 7.02%; Stroud, 9.30%; Winterville, 8.33%; Coile, 20.00%; Cedar, 33.33%
(4) Professional learning in our school provides opportunities for teachers and administrators to learn: Fowler, 57.14%; Harris, 17.54%; Stroud, 27.91%; Winterville, 19.44%; Coile, 40.00%; Cedar, 42.11%
(5) Our principal and other school administrators utilize multiple types of data to drive and monitor instruction: Fowler, 32.14%; Harris, 8.77%; Stroud, 2.33%; Winterville, 5.56%; Coile, 5.45%; Cedar, 35.09%

With a Striving Readers grant, professional learning will focus on teachers' abilities to analyze student-achievement data and student work related to literacy; enhance CCSD's response-to-intervention literacy program; use data to inform instruction on a day-to-day, student-by-student basis; and increase teacher expertise in reading and writing strategies across content areas.

c. Listing of Individuals Who Participated in the Needs Assessment:

- Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services & School Performance
- Dr. Mark Tavernier, Director of Teaching and Learning and SR Project Director
- Xernona Thomas, Principal, J.J. Harris Elementary Charter School
- Deborah Haney, Principal, Winterville Elementary School

- Tim Jarboe, Director of Assessment
- Dr. Toni Reed, Director of Grants & Research
- Lynn Snelling, Executive Director, Technology Services
- Dr. Tony Price, Principal, Cedar Shoals High School
- Dwight Manzy, Principal, Coile Middle School
- Anissa Johnson, Principal, Fowler Drive Elem. School
- Dr. Ingrid Gilbert, Principal, Stroud Elementary School
- Alita Anderson, Elem. Literacy Coach
- Carlyn Maddox, Secondary Literacy Coach
- School-based Literacy Teams of 5-7 people each

III. AREAS OF CONCERN

a & b. Areas of Concern as They Relate to the Researched-based Practices Found in the "What" Document: DOE's "What" document stresses writing as an important foundation for literacy development beginning with children birth to three years of age (p. 2) and extending through twelfth grade (p. 15). Skills learned during the first five years—including alphabet knowledge, awareness and concepts of print, writing as a means of communication, use of writing tools, and early attempts at writing—provide the foundation for later, more sophisticated reading and writing mastery. Many Clarke County students enter kindergarten without prerequisite oral-language skills and emergent reading and writing skills. For teachers, reading and writing instruction is challenging at every level. As teachers in all content areas learn effective ways of incorporating reading and writing instruction into their daily lessons, student's literacy skills are expected to improve. Across the school district, the most conspicuous areas of concerns are: (1) transitions from Pre-K to kindergarten, K to 1st grade, 5th to 6th, and 8th to 9th; (2) literacy-focused vertical and horizontal alignment; (3) instructional materials for grades K-2; (4) Lexile scores for high school students; (5) strategies for addressing student motivation; and (6) professional-learning on research-based instructional strategies for teaching reading and writing, including across the curriculum.

c. Areas of Concern and Steps Schools Have or Have Not Taken to Address Them:

Areas of Concern	What CCSD Has Done or Has NOT Done to Address the Problem
1	CCSD has few SBRR services in place to address transitions between these early grades.
2	Vertical alignment has been achieved in K-5 and 6-8, but CCSD has not vertically aligned literacy efforts in transitions from grades 8-9 or in grades 9-12.
3	K-2 does not have a core reading series for this age group.
4	CCSD does not currently determine Lexile scores for high school students.
5	Because students typically are competent users of technology, handheld computing devices, such as iPads or e-readers, increase student motivation to learn; through professional learning opportunities, teachers need to learn additional ways of increasing student motivation to learn.
6	CCSD provides ongoing professional learning and middle and high schools in reading and writing strategies identified in School Improvement Plans, but there has not been a systematic effort K-12 for literacy goals. Teachers need intensive professional learning focused on literacy, especially literacy instruction across the curriculum.

Table 9: Areas of Concern and Solutions

IV. ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

a. Root or Underlying Causes of the Areas of Concern Found in the Needs Assessment:

Each July, CCSD provides schools with an "Annual District Data Notebook" that summarizes school and district performance on all state and district assessments. During pre-planning of each school year, CCSD provides schools with re-rostered data to match each school's current enroll-ment. During the 2010-2011 school year, the Instructional Services Division conducted over 2,500 classroom walkthroughs to assess the implementation of standards-based classrooms. Each school's School Improvement Leadership Teams use these data to conduct root cause analyses in order to target specific students, grades levels, and content areas in need of focused effort. During the Striving Readers planning and grant-writing stage, school-based Literacy Teams examined school-specific literacy data in their attempt to discover: (1) areas of concern; (2) specific root causes of the identified areas of concern; (3) gaps in each school's comprehen-sive literacy plan when compared to DOE's "What" document; (4) what each

school's identified needs are as the literacy teams designed a comprehensive literacy plan for the school; and (5) the action steps needed to implement the literacy plan. For specific root-cause analyses results, see each school's grant proposal.

b. Specific Grade Levels Affected: Literacy practices at all grade levels must be improved. Over the past five or six years, only two elementary schools have implemented literacy grants (Reading Excellence Act and Reading First). CCSD's Early Learning Center, however, has implemented two Early Reading First grants (the largest ERF grants in the nation), which include Pre-K programs at all 14 elementary schools. Transitions between grades and vertical articula-tion of teaching practices need to take place throughout the school district. Grades K-2 do not currently have a core reading series, and Lexile scores for high school students are currently not available with current assessments. DIBELS and Scholastic Reading Inventory will be integrated into the current assessment schedule and practices.

c. Specific Rationale for the Determination of the Cause: There has been a lack of intensive, coordinated *districtwide* professional learning—birth through 12th grade—on *how* to teach reading and writing across the curriculum effectively to all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.

d. What Has Been Done in the Past to Address the Problem: Professional learning focused on literacy has been offered primarily to early learning and elementary teachers. The district has purchased software programs, e.g., *FastForword* and *READ 180*, to supplement Tier I instruction for students in grades 6-12. CCSD recently purchased *Voyager* for grades 1-8.

e. New Information the Needs Assessment Uncovered: The need for Lexile scores for high school students; the need for additional materials and assessments for RTI Tiers 2, 3, and 4.

V. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

a. List of Project Goals Directly Related to the Identified Needs:

Table 10: Needs and Goals	
Identified Needs	**Goals**
Reading and writing instruction in all content areas based on specific strategies needed for each discipline; professional learning on content (e.g., grammar) and pedagogy (instructional strategies on RTI Tiers).	**Goal 1**: To increase best practices with teachers of every content area in direct, explicit reading instruction, and writing proficiency.
Professional learning related to formative and summative assessments birth through 12th grade is needed for effective RTI monitoring.	**Goal 2**: To implement frequent screening, diagnostic, progress, and summative assessments so reading and writing proficiency is monitored for all students in Tiers 1-4.
Although ELA standards are vertically and horizontally aligned, teachers' knowledge of standards, skill levels, and practices required for other grades is lacking.	**Goal 3**: To clearly articulate vertically and horizontally common core standards and standards-based practices so that cohesion is experienced between grades and schools.

b. Project Objectives That Relate to Implementing the Goals Identified:

Table 11: Project Objectives	
Goals	**Objectives**
1	**1.1:** All students in Tiers 1-4 will receive direct and explicit reading strategies, including application of strategies for diverse texts, guided practice of strategies appropriate to the difficulty of texts, extended reading time with an instructional focus. **1.2:** All students in Tiers 1-4 will receive explicit vocabulary instruction, including learning new words by multiple exposures in a variety of contexts, and strategies to become independent vocabulary learners (knowledge of word components, use of reference materials). **1.3:** All students in Tiers 1-4 will receive writing strategies in every content area, including writing in all content areas on a daily basis and engaging in the writing process for specific audiences or purposes. **1.4:** Quarterly research-based writing will be required in all content areas.
2	**2.1:** All students will be assessed quarterly on reading comprehension and writing proficiency and will receive strategic instruction through Tier 1 and Tier 2-4 interventions. **2.2:** Teachers will identify Tier 2-4 students and their literacy assets and deficits by domains, and 90% of students will be correctly placed on Tiers 1-4, as appropriate. **2.3:** Teachers will provide interventions appropriate for students on Tiers 2-4, as indicated by ongoing formative assessments and will track student results.
3	**3.1**: Teachers will actively participate in professional-learning communities for multiple grade levels; schools will meet quarterly to examine benchmarks and similar student data as well as RTI data on a student-by-student basis. **3.2:** Professional learning includes comprehensive training and re-delivery of common core training with job embedded follow-up for all teachers by administrators and instructional coaches. **3.3:** During Year 1, Curriculum Teams (early learning, elementary and secondary) will meet to create vertical and horizontal

	articulation documents that teachers will use to plan instruction. **3.4:** All students will receive literacy common core standards and standards-based practices in all content areas.

c. Research-Based Practices in the "What" and "Why" Document as a Guide for Establishing Goals and Objectives:

Table 12: Research-Based Practices that Support Goals & Objectives	
Goals & Obj.	**Research-Based Practices**
Goal 1 Obj. 1.1-1.4	Grade-level or content groups of teachers will focus on student work and data to plan instruction and interventions on a student-by-student basis; provide modeling, classroom observations, and coaching to improve instruction; require all students to write extensively—extended prose in elementary and essays in high school; use functional approaches to teaching the rules of grammar; provide students with opportunities for collaborative writing; study media approaches to writing; use multiple formative assessments that provide students with detailed feedback ("Why," p. 46); have students write about the texts they read, and explicitly teach students the writing skills and processes that go into creating text ("Why," p. 48). Use Mills' list of non-conventional reading skills (i.e., multimodal cueing systems; emergent, screen-based genres; non-linear reading comprehension and navigation skills; computer skills, such as switching between reading and writing; and critical literacy skills ("Why," p. 52).teachers must become proficient in the use of instructional technology; identify consultants to work with CCSD secondary schools on reading and writing for struggling adolescents and reading and writing across the curriculum; let students pick some of their reading material; provide opportunities for teachers, especially at the secondary level, to earn Reading Endorsements.
Goal 2 Obj. 2.1 & 2.3	Non-ELA teachers will participate in intensive PL to learn how to strategically incorporate literacy instruction in all content classes; teachers will design project-based learning assignments that require collaborative research and writing; teach students at all reading levels and all content areas to visualize, question, make connections, predict, infer, determine importance, and synthesize/create; help students to relate content material to their own lives; help students become proficient in three types of texts—argument, informative/explanatory, narrative ("Why," pp. 44-45);
Goal 3 Obj. 3.1 - 3.4	Teachers will use "Lexile Ranges Aligned to CCR Expectations" ("Why," p. 50); update Growth charts following formative assessments; design and deliver lessons and assignments based on Growth Chart groupings.

d. Practices Already in Place When Determining Goals and Objectives:

Table 13: Practices Already in Place That Support Goals & Objectives	
Goals and Obj.	**CCSD's Practices**
Goal 1; Obj. 1.1-1.4	Formative & summative assessments, classroom walkthroughs; data summits; data notebooks; coordinated professional-learning sessions; annual School Improvement Surveys of teachers, students, and parents; school-improvement process
Goal 2; Obj.	Four-Tier RTI process; targeted professional-learning; "Assessment Calendar"

2.1 - 2.3	(see Appendix A)
Goal 3; Obj. 3.1 & 3.4	Limited use of Lexiles; limited use of Reading Growth Charts; Curriculum Renewal Committees

e. Goals to Be Funded with Other Sources: All of the Striving Readers Goals will be

supported with local, state, federal funds and competitive grant funds when available.

VI. SCIENTIFIC, EVIDENCE-BASED LITERACY PLAN

a. Plan to Implement the Goals and Objectives Identified: Over the past several years,

Clarke County leaders and teachers have implemented some elements of a comprehensive, districtwide

literacy plan, but until the Striving Readers grant opportunity became available, CCSD had never

designed or implemented an evidence-based birth-through-12th-grade literacy plan. During Year 1, CCSD

will provide targeted, differentiated professional learning for admin-istrators and teachers in the six

Striving Readers schools and Early Learning Center; implement reading and writing across the

curriculum; develop Reading Growth Charts that will immediately enable teachers to identify and

respond to students at all performance levels; purchase new instructional materials and diverse texts;

base lesson plans on the Common Core GPS; and implement handheld computing devices in target

grades to increase student engagement. During Year 2, CCSD will provide professional learning and will

develop a scope and sequence for CCGPS ELA Standards. In years 3-5, CCSD will collect and report data

and will continue to administer the Striving Readers Literacy Plan in target schools and expand SR

practices to additional schools. Dr. Mark Tavernier, Director of Teaching and Learning, will serve as

Project Director for the Striving Readers grant. Dr. Tavernier administers CCSD's curriculum and

instruction programs in all content areas, the district's professional-learning program, textbooks, and

state and federal grant projects in the content areas. In addition, he supervises content coaches and

instructional technology specialists. As Project Director, he will facilitate the work of a districtwide

Literacy Team initially composed of leaders and teachers from the six targeted schools and Early

Learning Center. The Literacy Team will ensure that the activities presented in this grant proposal are implemented with fidelity.

All grant activities will support the nine research-based key components that provide the foundation of comprehensive literacy plans ("What," p. 1): (1) standards; (2) components unique to birth-to-five; (3) ongoing formative and summative assessments; (4) response to intervention; (5) best practices in instruction; (6) high-quality teachers; (7) engaged leadership; (8) clearly articulated plan for transitions and alignment; (9) intentional strategies for maintaining engage-ment. All grant activities will be aligned with these nine key components, as follows:

| Table 14: Grant Activities and Their Alignment with Nine Key Components ||
9 Com-ponents	Activities
1	Standards for birth to three; Pre-K; K-5; 6-8; and 9-12, including the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards in ELA.
2	Provide professional-learning activities based on birth-5 standards.[4]
3	Update the birth-5 assessment schedule to fill gaps in data collection; use Work Sampling System to share data with kindergarten teachers; provide transition support for infants moving from infant to toddler, toddler to preschool and preschool to Pre-K programs; Pre-K to K; K to 1; 1 to 2; 2 to 3; 5 to 6; 8 to 9 ("What," pp. 11-12). In January 2012, Cedar Shoals High School will implement a new Rising 9th Grade Transition Program for Coile Middle School students (as well as Cedar's other feeder middle school).
4	See Clarke County's Response to Intervention – Literacy, (see Appendix B); "What," pp. 15-16).
5	Provide professional learning on high-impact, research-based best practices for birth-5, elementary, middle school, and high school teachers; provide best practices for reading and writing instruction across the curriculum ("What," pp. 12-15).
6	Beginning in August 2012, classroom walkthroughs (see Appendix C) will focus on literacy for two years. During the 2011-2012 school year, CCSD is implementing a new CCSD Teacher Evaluation System that replaces the GTEP. The new multi-tiered, rigorous system identifies specific instructional and classroom skills and content knowledge that teachers need to master in order to become highly effective teachers. The new system also provides teachers with a pathway to school leadership.
7	As instructional leaders, principals will monitor the literacy RTI program in their schools, participate in professional-learning sessions focused on literacy (e.g., coaches' training, redelivery of training for teachers). Implementation and impact analysis of the Striving Readers grant will be built into monthly professional-learning communities for principals

---

[4] In addition to providing direct services at the district's Early Learning Center, CCSD partners with two community early learning centers to provide birth-to-five educational and developmental services to students based on Early Head Start, Head Start, Pre-K, and Early Reading First standards and requirements.

	and district leaders ("What," pp. 16-17).
8	In CCSD, an area of concern involves *transitions*, particularly between birth-to-three to Pre-K, Pre-K to kindergarten, kindergarten to first grade, fifth grade to sixth grade, and eighth to ninth grade ("What," p. 11). A central feature of the proposed Striving Readers implementation plan, teachers will focus on developmental stages of childhood, vertical alignment of standards, ongoing assessments, and RTI ("What," p. 18).
9	Teachers will adopt A-F action steps ("What," p. 19). As a strategy for maintaining student engagement, grant funding is requested for handheld computing devices for 5th- and 8th-grade students and their teachers, as well as school media centers.

b. Who Will Implement: Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services and School Performance, will oversee the Striving Readers grant. Dr. Mark Tavernier will serve as Project Director. Each of the schools in the Cedar/Coile cluster—plus the Early Learning Center—will implement its own Striving Readers' Literacy Plan, which have all been coordinated with the overarching district's grant proposal.

c. What Will Take Place in the Project Based on the "What" Document: Early Learn-ing Center: Vertical alignment with kindergarten and first grade (p. 4); improve transitions from one learning environment to another; additional reading materials; 4-Tier model (p. 15-16). Four elementary schools: Adopt DIBELS (pp. 11-12); 90-110 minutes of protected literacy time for grades K-3 and 2-4 hours per day for grades 4-5 (p. 15); vertical alignment with Pre-K and grades K-6; improve transitions from one grade to another (p. 11); additional reading materials. Coile Middle School: Alignment with fifth grade and ninth grade; improve transitions from one grade to another; additional reading materials; 2-4 hours of literacy instruction per day (p. 15); 4-Tier model (p. 15-16). Cedar Shoals High School: Adopt Scholastic Reading Inventory to obtain Lexile scores; focus on college and career readiness (p.7); improve transitions from one grade to another; additional and more complex reading materials (p.7); 2-4 hours of literacy instruction per day (p. 15); 4-Tier model (p. 15-16).

d. Current Instructional Schedule:

Birth-Two: 8:00 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.
Head Start-3 and Pre-K: 7:40-2:45
Kindergarten - 5: School hours are 7:40 a.m. – 2:35 p.m.
Grades 6-8: School hours are 8:25 a.m. – 3:45 p.m.
Grades 9-12: School hours are 8:25 a.m. – 3:35 p.m. Clarke County high schools are currently on a 4 x 4 block schedule. Credit recovery is available during zero and fifth periods.

e. Plan for Tiered Instruction:

Tier 1: 100% of students—universal screenings; GPS/CCGPS through a standards-based classroom structure; differentiation of instruction including fluid, flexible grouping, multiple means of learning, and demonstration of learning.
Tier 2: 10% of students—Tier 1 and standard intervention protocol process for identifying and providing research-based interventions based on need and resources; ongoing progress monitoring to measure RTI and to guide decision making.
Tier 3: 5% of students—Tiers 1 and 2 and SST-driven learning, including intensive, formalized problem solving to identify student needs; targeted research-based interventions tailored to individual needs; frequent progress monitoring and analysis of student RTI.
Tier 4: 2-5% of students—Tiers 1-3 and specialized programs, methodologies or instructional delivery; greater frequency of progress monitoring of student RTI.

f. Materials Currently Used for Tier 1 Instruction: Table 15 lists reading series and

materials for all Clarke County schools. These materials, and others specific to individual schools, are

used for reading/language arts instruction.

Table 15: Literacy Materials Currently Being Used for Tier I (Universal) Instruction	
Age/Grade Levels	*Materials*
Birth – Five	Infants and Toddlers: *1, 2, 3 READ*; HS 3s: *Scholastic Early Childhood Program*; All 4s: *Opening the World of Learning*, *Breakthrough To Literacy*
Kindergarten	*Rigby Literacy*; *Phonics Lessons*
Elementary Schools	*StoryTown*; *Rigby Literacy*; *Phonics Lessons*; *Writers Express*
Middle Schools	*KeyTrain*; *Nettrekker*; *Renzulli Learning*; *Scantron Achievement Series*; *SOLO*; *TinkerPlots*; *FastForWord*; *Ticket to Read*; *SuccessMaker*; *Reading A to Z*; *Vocabulary A to Z*; *Destination Reading*
High Schools	*Nettrekker*; *Scantron Achievement Series*; *SOLO*

g. Time, Personnel and Strategies for Tier II, III, IV, and V Instruction: CCSD uses a

four-tier RTI strategy (see Appendix B). CCSD's RTI plan is shown in Table 16:

Table 16: Literacy Plan for Tiers II, II, and IV Instruction			
Grade Levels	*Time*	*Personnel*	*Strategies*
Birth - 5			
Tier II	Standard instructional time	All classroom & collab. teachers	Differentiation; small group targeted instruction in content areas and language and literacy development.
Tier III	Extended instructional time	All classroom and support personnel	Individualized instruction during cooperative learning work sessions (1:1 or 2:1); extended day/extended year
Tier IV	Extended/pre-scriptive	Classroom & SPED teachers	Special education services delivered according to IEP in the least restrictive environment
Elementary Schools			
Tier II	90-120 min.	All classroom teachers	Universal screeners, benchmark assessments; small group, differentiated support/interventions; extended PL; add'l. engagement/motivational strategies
Tier III	Extended/ prescriptive	Classroom teachers	Individualized or small groups; add'l. monitoring with frequent contacts; explicit vocab; comprehension strategies; add'l. engagement & motivational strategies.
Tier IV	Extended/ Prescriptive based on IEP	Classroom & SPED teachers	Targeted remediation or acceleration instruction; push in, pullout; individualized instruction; explicit use of intervention, motivational and engagement strategies
Middle and High Schools			
Tier II	Standard instructional time	All classroom & collab. teachers	Differentiation; students in smaller groups; fre-quent monitoring of progress; in MS, *Voyager* is used in some small classes with all three RTI Tiers.
Tier III	Longer instructional time	All classroom & collab. teachers	Longer-term intervention; collaborative teaching; more frequent progress monitoring; content instructional materials; SOLO/Read OutLoud; Read 180.
Tier IV	Instructional time; time in labs	All classroom & collab. teachers	Individualized instruction with specialized pro-grams and collaborative teaching processes; course instructional materials; SOLO/Read OutLoud; Read 180

h. Statement Regarding Conflict with Other Initiatives: CCSD's Striving Readers grant

implementation plan conflicts with no other CCSD, state, or federal initiative that the school dis-trict is

currently implementing or anticipates implementing. The district's two key initiatives—International

Baccalaureate for secondary schools and a Professional Development Schools Part-nership with the

University of Georgia—will be supported by a Striving Readers grant, providing the same level of rigor,

focus, high expectations for teacher and student success.

VII. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES BASED ON DOCUMENTED NEEDS

a. **Table Indicating the Professional Learning Activities That Staff Have Attended in the Past Year:**

Table 17: Professional-Learning Activities That Staff Have Attended in the Past Year			
PL Activities	**Dates[5]/ Hours**	**Purpose**	**# Teachers**
Early Reading First Summer Institute	7-19-10/130	Routines and procedures; strategies to de-escalate inappropriate student behavior, classroom observations, ELL students;	91
Pre-K & ERF	8-3-10/48	Using GA Content Standards & GA Early Learning Standards	55
ERF	8-13-10/50	For ERF Interventionists; standards, assessments/progress monitoring, CCSD's framework for delivering lessons	12
Literacy Materials	7-28-10/34	*Voyager Passports* for ES; *Voyager Reading* for MS and HS; *Read 180* for HS	78
ESOL Students	8-3-10/110	Elementary ESOL teachers; MS/HS ESOL teachers; curriculum; use of data; instructional strategies based on needs.	42
Gifted Students	8-3-10/170	Human development, individual differences, developing talents, cultural factors	115
Benchmark Institute	5-24-10/40	Review and revise CCSD Benchmark tests; connections to CCSD's "Non-Negotiables" (See Appendix D) and Goals	40

b. **Number of Hours of Professional Learning That Staff Have Attended:** During the 2010-2011 school year, 1,929 Clarke County school administrators, teachers, and other professionals participated in 2,392 hours of district-provided professional learning (not including school-specific PL sessions). Of those, 458 of the sessions were literacy related and were attend-ed by 407 teachers and others.[6] Topics ranged from specific literacy programs, such as *Read 180*, *Voyager Passports*, *Voyager Reading*, and *Headsprout*, to guided reading, writing data teams, and ESOL methods and materials.

---

[5] Starting dates; PL continued throughout the school year.
[6] Some teachers attended numerous PL sessions and therefore may be counted two or more times.

c. The Percentage of Staff Attending Professional Learning: CCSD has approximately 1,100 teachers, which means that about 37% of teachers participated in literacy-related professional-learning sessions last year—indicating a large gap in literacy training across the school district.

d. Detailed List of Ongoing Professional Learning:

- Content-specific curriculum renewal
- School-improvement planning
- Core Curriculum GPS
- PL provided by grants (e.g., Title I, Math & Science Partnership, Early Reading First, 21st Century Community Learning Centers)
- Data/assessment/domain/root-cause analyses
- Special populations (e.g., special education, economically disadvantaged, ESOL)
- New Teacher Orientation/Mentoring
- Special initiatives/special focus (e.g., International Baccalaureate, Professional Development Schools)

e. Preferred Method of Delivery of Professional Learning: CCSD provides a wide range of professional-learning opportunities for teachers and building and district leaders, including face-to-face, small- and large-group sessions with local and nationally known experts; job-embedded instructional coaching in each school; webinars; and monthly professional-learning communities for many groups (e.g., ESOL teachers, Technol-ogy Integration Specialists, Counselors, Instructional Coaches) that incorporate intensive work sessions. In addition, some teachers enroll in graduate programs or endorsement programs.

f. Programmatic Professional Learning Needs Identified in the Needs Assessment: The results of the needs assessments carried out by the six target schools and Early Learning Center indicated a universal need for professional learning for teachers and administrators in the following areas: High-impact, research-based instructional methods of teaching reading and writing from birth through 12th grade; effective strategies for teaching literacy across the curriculum (especially the structure of texts, content vocabulary, and comprehension); reading

endorsements; assessments for high school students that provides Lexile scores; as well as school-by-school literacy needs.

VIII.   ASSESSMENT/DATA ANALYSIS PLAN

a.   Detailed Listing of the District's Current Assessment Protocol: CCSD's current assessment protocol is based on the Assessment Strand of the *Georgia School Keys*. Tier 1 provides 100% of students with a standards-based classroom learning environment. Tier 2 provides a needs-based, standard intervention protocol for struggling students. Tier 3 provides intensive, SST-driven learning for approximately 5% of students, and Tier 4 provides, in addition to Tiers 1-3 services, specialized programs and instructional strategies, and a greater frequency of progress monitoring of RTI. For the district's four-tier "CCSD Educator's Guide for Response to Intervention (RTI)" pyramid and "Assessment Calendar" (see Appendix A).

b.   Explanation of the Current Data Analysis Protocol: All CCSD schools implement the district's Data Team Process for grade and subject area teams. The process involves five steps: **Step 1**: Collect/Chart Data Results (develop system for organizing data from a pre-assessment); establish levels of proficiency; prepare a graph/chart to include teacher and student data. **Step 2**: Analyze Data (identify skills and concepts proficient students use and understand by examining actual student work; list obstacles/reasons why students did not achieve a level of proficiency; prioritize the identified skill concept weaknesses to focus teaching). **Step 3**: Set, Review, or Revise Goals (using data from Step 1, generate a number/percentage to serve as a goal or desired outcome). **Step 4**: Design Instructional Strategies; Team agrees on 2-3 strategies to implement during next teaching period; model or demonstrate strategy to group. **Step 5**: Interpret Results Using Common Assessments, Teams will use this process on an ongoing basis with data reviews at least every three weeks. This process is not an add-on to grade-level functions but provides a structure for teacher teams to identify student academic

needs and changes to instructional delivery. Use of the Data Team Process can facilitate the steps of the

RTI actions required during the 2011-2012 school year. For the 2011-2012 Assessment Calendar and

further discussion of CCSD's Data Analysis, see Appendix A.

c. Comparison of the Current Protocol with the Striving Readers Assessment Plan: Table

18 compares the district's current assessment plan with a proposed assessment plan.

Table 18: Comparison of Current and Proposed Assessment Protocols	
Current Assessment Plan:	
Birth to 5	Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-III) 1 x per year (screening) for ages 0-5 (Early Head Start & Head Start); Developmental Profile (DP-III) 2 x per year Pre-K and 3 x year EHS (progress monitoring and outcome) for ages 0-5 (EHS, HS, Pre-K); BASQ-II 2 x per year (screening & progress monitoring) for ages 2-5 (EHS and HS); GELS Checklist – ongoing (progress monitoring) for ages 0-3; Get it, Got It, Go! – monthly (progress monitoring, outcome) for ages (Pre-K, EHS); Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-IV) 2 x year (3 x if below benchmark) (screening, progress, outcome) for ages 3-5 (Pre-K, HS, Early Reading First); Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for Preschool (PALS Pre-K) 3 x year (monitoring, outcome) for ages 3-5; Work Sampling System – ongoing (monitor-ing, outcome) for ages 4-5 (Pre-K, HS)
K	GKIDS
K-8	Ongoing diagnostic literacy assessments for grades K-8; scored writing samples quarterly.
Grade 1	Voyager Oral Reading Fluency
Grades 1 & 2	Phonics Test, Sight Word Tests, CCSD Fluency Assessment, Informal Running Record, Rigby Literacy Benchmarks; Scantron Performance Series provides norm-referenced, diagnostic summative ELA data in Dec. and May.
Grades 1-8	ACCESS for ELL students
Grades 2-8	Scantron Performance Series provides norm-referenced, diagnostic ELA data.
Grades 3-8 & 11	Benchmark assessments every 6 weeks; CRCT or CRCT-M, for specific students with disabilities
Grades 3, 5, & 8	State Writing Test annually in grades 3, 5, 8
Grades 6-8	*Read 180*; *Voyager*, Quarterly Writing Samples
Grades 9-12	*Read 180*; literacy assessments throughout year for 9th grade students; GA High School Writing Test for grades 11 & 12; Literature & Composition, grades 9-11
Striving Readers Assessment Plan:	
Grades	**Assessments**
Birth to 2	DP-III, ASQ-III, GELS Checklist
3-Pre-K	WSS/WSO, PPVT-IV, PALS Pre-K or Locally Developed Literacy Measure, GGG
K	GKIDS
K-2	Writing Samples; Sight Vocabulary
K-5	1st Quarter Literacy Assessments (reading level)
K-8	3rd Quarter Literacy Assessment; Reading Level
K-9	Reading Level; 2nd and 4th Quarter Literacy Assessments

1-2	Writing samples; Spelling Inventory; Sight Vocabulary; Comprehensive Benchmark Assessments
1-8	Reading Fluency; 2nd Quarter ELA Benchmarks
2-8	Norm-referenced in Reading and Language Arts
3-8	CRCTs; CRCT-M; Writing Samples; Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
3-8 & 11	Georgia Alternative Assessment
5	Writing Test
8	Writing Test
6-8	CRCTs, GA Eighth-Grade Writing Test; *Scholastic Reading Inventory*; *Read 180* Stage B
9-12	Advanced Placement; End-of-Course Tests, Graduation Test; Graduation Writing Test; PSAT (grade 10); *Scholastic Reading Inventory* (SRI) (Lexile Scores) for *Read 180*, Stage C
K-12	ACCESS (for ELL)
9-12	*KeyTrain* is used primarily in Career and Technical Education classes for literacy enrichment and building ELA skills.

d. How the New Assessments Will Be Implemented into the Current Assessment Schedule:

Elementary schools will incorporate an assessment, such as DIBELS, to identify students having

difficulties with phonemic awareness and phonics. Coile Middle School and Cedar Shoals High

School will adopt an assessment, such as the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), that will

provide student Lexile scores for the first time to track students' RTI plans.

e. Current Assessments That Might Be Discontinued: For high school students, CCSD

currently uses district-based screeners and assessments such as *STEEP MAZE* to identify reading

levels. As a result of Striving Readers, CCSD will discontinue this assessment and use Scholastic

Reading Inventory for all students and other interventional assessments as needed.

f. Listing of Training That Teachers Will Need to Implement Any New Assessments:

Teachers will need to be trained on DIBELS and the Scholastic Reading Inventory.

g. How Data Is Presented to Parents and Stakeholders: CCSD has a districtwide Family

Engagement and Equity Plan for families of Clarke County students with seven components: family

inclusiveness, effective communication, parenting skills, equitable school culture, shared decision-

making, community collaboration, and equity in human resources. Because all CCSD schools are Title I schools, they utilize a "School-Family Partnership Agreement" that clarifies goals, expectations, and shared responsibilities of the school and parents as partners for student learning. The Agreement or compact is signed and dated by the student, parents, and teacher. CCSD's website provides teachers, students, parents, and community with AYP data, CCSD's Strategic Plan with District Performance Measures and aggregate data, "Facts and Figures," "Annual Performance Report," and many other reports of interest to stakeholders. Report cards and parent-teacher conferences provide parents with academic data on their children.

IX.   EXPERIENCE OF THE APPLICANT

a. Table Describing Other Initiatives with which the LEA Has Been Involved:

Table 19: Other CCSD Initiatives
• CCSD partners with the Georgia DOE and University of Georgia College of Education to develop new model-learning environments with an emphasis on student use of technology embedded into everyday learning. DOE will provide instructional technology consultation, technical assistance, access to Georgia Virtual online content, professional learning, assistance with funding formulas and waivers, and statewide purchasing. UGA will assist with teacher preparation, professional learning, and research related to instructional design, student learning, and teacher practices.

- CCSD partners UGA's College of Education to develop and implement Professional Development Schools (PDS). Several schools are at various stages of implementing PDSs. Harris Elementary was the first PDS school. A Professor-in-Residence and many UGA faculty and students are in classrooms throughout the day.
- CCSD partners with the UGA College of Education and Franklin College of Arts & Sciences to implement eight years of state Math and Science Partnership grants.
- CCSD partnered with Athens Technical College to construct and implement the Athens Community Career Academy, a charter program that opened in August 2011.

b. **Initiatives the LEA Has Implemented Internally with No Outside Funding Support:**

1) Professional-Learning Communities for school and district leaders meet each month to engage in data analysis and professional growth as leaders.

2) International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme (grades 6-10).

3) Orchestra programs at Coile Middle School and another middle school and afterschool orchestra and band programs for several elementary schools.

4) CCSD's Advanced Placement Fee Program pays for one AP exam for students.

c. **Description of the LEA's Capacity to Coordinate Resources in the Past:** CCSD Coordinates millions of dollars worth of formula and competitive grants each year under the dir-ection of Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services and School Per-formance. Dr. Price and district directors in charge of Title I, Title II, Title III, Title VI, Head Start, Early Head Start as well as competitive grants, such as Math and Science Partnership grants, 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants, and Early Reading First grants, rou-tinely coordinate grant budgets with other federal, state, and local fiscal resources.

d. **Description of the Sustainability of Initiatives Implemented by the LEA:** Following the implementation of several state Math and Science Partnership grants, many of the instructional strategies for teaching math and science in grades 3-12 have been institutionalized in the Clarke County School District. The same is true of a Georgia Department of Human Services

afterschool and summer contract and four 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) grants. The original philosophy and instructional approaches (relevant, engaging, hands-on, project-based academic enrichment) that defined the district's first 21st CCLC were sub-sequently adopted by all of the district's out-of-school programs.

X. RESOURCES

a. Clear Alignment Plan for Striving Readers and All Other Funding:

Table 20: Alignment of Funding Sources		
	Striving Readers Funding	**Other Funding Sources**
Professional Learning	Intensive, aligned PL for all Striving Readers teachers	Title II, Part A; Title I, Part A; GA Staff Development Funds; QBE; Title III (ESL); Title VI, Part B; IDEA Pre-School
Print Materials	Additional books for all 7 Media Centers	Early Reading First (ERF); Title I, Part A;
Tier I Literacy Materials	Universal screener/progress monitoring; classroom libraries (K-5); core SBRR program for K-2; supple-mental SBRR materials for small groups; technology	ERF; Early Intervention Program (EIP); QBE; Extended-Year
Tier II Literacy Materials	Supplemental SBRR intervention materials; high interest/low level trade books; technological resources	ERF; EIP/REP
Tier III Literacy Materials	Supplemental interventions materials; technological resources	ERF; EIP/REP
Tier IV Literacy Materials	Targeted classroom libraries; technological resources	ERF; EIP/REP
Formative and Summative Assessments	Additional assessments: Informal reading inventory, phonemic aware-ness, phonics, fluency screener; (DIBELS; Scholastic – SRI)	EIP/REP; Extended Year; Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III; Title VI, Part B; IDEA, Part B (SWDs); IDEA Pre-School (SWDs)
Instructional Technology	Handheld computing devices	SPLOST IV
Parent/Family Communication	Striving Readers updates to parents/ families via website, Channel 16 (school district TV channel), school newsletters, newspaper articles	QBE; Title I, Part A; Title III; Title IV, Part B; IDEA, Part B (SWDs)

b. List of the Resources Available at Each Building:

- SmartBoards & overhead projectors

- Electronic student-response systems
- Media Center with fiction and non-fiction books
- Document cameras
- Literacy software programs (e.g., FastForword, SuccessMaker)

c. Plan to Ensure That No Supplanting Takes Place: During the grant-writing phase, as well as at the beginning of Years 1-3 of the performance period, all budget items in the partici-pating school budgets will be examined by the Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services as well as the district-based Directors of Teaching and Learning, Special Education, Career and Technical Education, Title I, Assessment and Accountability, Gifted and ESOL Services, Grants and Research, Technology Services, and Business Services to ensure that supplanting will not take place, except as allowed by federal Striving Readers rules.

d. Detail How Striving Readers Will Add Value to Existing Resources in Schools: A Striving Readers grant will provide intensive professional learning for teachers in six cluster

schools and the district's Early Learning Center. Training will focus on emergent literacy skills, how children become proficient readers and writers, how to teach reading and writing across the curriculum, and how to identify and assist readers at all performance levels. A grant would also provide an opportunity for teachers and students in the target schools to explore the capabilities of handheld computing devices, such as iPads, to facilitate group writing projects, group research assignments, and communication and collaboration between teachers and their students and between and among the students themselves. For the first time, a Striving Readers grant would provide Clarke County teachers of students from birth through 12th grade with developmentally targeted, literacy-focused professional learning designed to facilitate the adoption of research-based, high-impact practices in every classroom within the six schools and Early Learning Center. In addition, technology purchased with grant funds will provide students with access to thousands of books, other materials in print, and online subscriptions to

which they would not otherwise have access. Handheld technology for students will also allow them to access educational apps and resources for the first time. Many students who do not typically read books would be far more likely to read the same books using e-readers. Striving Readers will offer these schools opportunities to instill 21st century literacy skills into all curricular areas and prepare students for college and career success.

XI.   MANAGEMENT PLAN AND KEY PERSONNEL

a. Plan for Management of the Grant Implementation: Dr. Mark Tavernier, Project Director, supervises the district's content specialists, including elementary and secondary literacy coaches; four instructional technology specialists; and two budget assistants. Tavernier's staff will be available to carry out grant activities, such as coordinating, scheduling, and, at times, providing professional-learning; training teachers on new formative and summative assessments; purchasing and distributing print materials; and training teachers on the peda-gogical uses of mobile technology. The principals of the Striving Readers' schools will oversee grant-focused literacy activities in their schools as part of a long-term strategy to institutionalize high-impact instructional practices. CCSD's Business Office has the capacity to drawdown Striving Readers grant funds as it currently does for numerous state and federal grant programs. Under the direction of Dr. Tavernier, a part-time Budget Assistant (paid for with indirect funds) will enter and process purchase orders, timecards, and other time sensitive records; and will receive, inventory, and distribute purchased items and services.

b. List of Individuals Responsible for the Day-to-Day Grant Operations:

- Dr. Noris Price, Associate Superintendent for Instructional Services
- Dr. Mark Tavernier, Project Director
- Carlyn Maddox, Secondary Literacy Coach
- Alita Anderson, Elementary Literacy Coach
- Linda Sprague, Office of Early Learning Professional Learning Coordinator

- Dr. Tony Price, Cedar Shoals High School
- Dwight Manzy, Coile Middle School
- Anissa Johnson, Fowler Drive Elementary
- Xernona Thomas, Harris Elementary
- Dr. Ingrid Gilbert, Stroud Elementary
- Debbie Haney, Winterville Elementary
- Tom Guthrie, Director of Business Services

- Carolyn Wolpert, Office of Early Learning Early Reading First Coordinator
- Kim Seabolt, Purchasing Coordinator
- Budget Assistant

c. Responsibilities of the People Involved with the Grant Implementation:

Table 21: Timeline of Grant Activities and Individuals Responsible									
	Year 1 Quarters				Year 2 Quarters				Yrs. 3-5
Grant Activities (Persons Responsible)[7]	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	
Announce SR grant to CCSD and the community. (PD, PR)	x	x			x	x			x
Convene District Literacy Team for overview/planning.(PD)	x		x		x		x		x
Convene school Literacy Teams for overview/planning. (P)	x	x	x		x	x	x		x
Purchase new assessments. (BA)	x				x				x
Purchase and distribute instructional materials and instructional technology. (PD, BA)	x	x			x	x			x
Plan/implement professional-learning focused on literacy (curriculum, assessments, RTI, etc.) (PD, LC)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Teachers enroll in Reading Endorsement Programs. (PD)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Extend early learning instructional days from 164 days to 180. (EL)			x				x		x
Extended literacy time (afterschool/summer). (PD, P, LC)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Drawdown funds. (BO)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	?
Write and submit end-of-year reports (5 years). (PD, LC, E)				x				x	x

d. Individuals Listed Understand the Goals, Objectives, and Implementation Plan: All

of the administrators, teachers, literacy coaches, and instructional technology specialists involved in

implementing the Striving Readers grant program as described in this grant proposal will have an

orientation session focused on the details of CCSD's Striving Readers implementation plan, as well as

DOE's "What" and "Why" documents (and the "How" document when it becomes available). At the

orientation session, all CCSD personnel will sign a commitment statement pledging to work towards

accomplishing the project's goals and objectives and grant activities described in the district's grant

---

[7] PD = Project Director; DL = District Literacy Team; SL = School Literacy Teams; P = Principals; BA = Budget Assistant; LC = Literacy Coaches; EL = Early Learning Literacy Team; ELA = ELA Teachers; CT = Content Teachers; PR = CCSD's Public Relations; BO = Business Office

proposal, combined with each school's Striving Readers grant proposal/implementation plan with fidelity.

XII. SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

a. Plan for Expanding the Lessons Learned through the Striving Readers Project with Other Schools and New Teachers to the LEA: During New Teacher Orientation every August, a summary of the Striving Readers Implementation Plan will be given to all new teachers. At the six target schools and Early Learning Center, a discussion of the grant program will be far more extensive, and all new teachers will be given a copy of this grant proposal that lists the instructional strategies, materials, and assessments that all teachers in the school will use in their classes, including teachers in other content areas, such as science, math, and social studies. Because the target schools in the Cedar/Coile cluster will serve as a pilot project for the entire district, CCSD intends to institutionalize the best literacy practices throughout the entire school district, as appropriate. Once CCSD's Striving Readers Literacy Plan is completed, using Georgia's Literacy Plan as a model, SR practices will be institutionalized in the school district.

To ensure sustainability of evidence-based, high-impact practices, the district-level Striving Readers Literacy Team compiled a list of no-cost activities that may be used during and beyond the grant-performance period. A partial list is provided below:

- Require 90 minutes per day of protected, uninterrupted reading time in elementary schools and two to four hours per day for middle and high school students
- Transition strategies horizontally and vertically across grade levels
- Knowing standards of grades before and after each teacher's grade
- Create Reading Growth Wall in every school that tracks student growth.
- Use DOE's Lexile Map to match reading materials to students' current lexile levels.
- Provide data summits to examine literacy assessment results at the domain and element levels
- Provide intensive in-house professional learning on literacy for struggling readers and RTI

- Facilitate reading and writing across the curriculum

These activities and others will sustain Clarke County's Striving Readers Literacy Plan well beyond the grant period.

b. Plan for Extending the Assessments Protocol beyond the Grant Period: Because CCSD expects the Striving Readers assessment protocol to result in increased student achieve-ment in the area of literacy due to ongoing, monitored formative and summative assessments, the assessment protocol will be sustained in the target schools. As the results are shared with other schools, additional schools will adopt the Striving Readers assessment protocol, which is based on high-impact practices for raising student-academic achievement.

c. Plan for Extending the Professional Learning Practices beyond the Grant Period and to New Staff to the System: Assessment data is useful only if teachers actually use it to make instructional decisions and adjustments. Therefore, teachers will be shown through on-going professional-learning sessions how to use screening, diagnostic, and progress assessment data to guide instruction. Principals will ensure that grade-level and content-specific teacher groups understand and use student-achievement data at the domain level for designing lessons and student tasks.

d. Plan for Sustaining Technology That Was Implemented with the SR Funds: The technology and site licenses funded by a Striving Readers grant will include handheld computing devices for students, their teachers, and Media Centers. The Clarke County Regional Library provides K-12 students with access to over 300,000 e-books and audiobook titles that can be downloaded on handheld tablets and computers 24 hours a day, seven days a week. After grant funding ends following Year 3, this virtual library will continue to be available to students with purchased technology as well as with classroom and media center computers already in place. To sustain CCSD's investment in technology made possible with Striving Readers funding, CCSD's

SPLOST IV, approved by voters in November 2011, will provide significant funding to expand the reach of handheld computing devices into all schools and to refresh the mobile technology in the six target Striving Readers schools and Early Learning Center.

STRIVING READERS

Judia Jackson Harris Elementary Charter School's Grant Proposal

XIII.   ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENT AND TEACHER DATA

a.   School Student CRCT Data: Judia Jackson Harris Elementary Charter School (JJH) has made AYP for the two years the school has been in operation. JJH's federal lunch program rate is 99%. Table 1 presents the assessment results for all JJH's students in grades 3, 4, and 5 who did *NOT* meet (DNM) standards on the 2010-2011 Criterion-References Competency Tests (CRCT) in Reading and Language Arts. A 2011 CRCT Reading Domain Analysis reveals the

Table 1: CRCT Data for Grades 3, 4, and 5- Did NOT Meet Standards						
Grades	% Reading DNM			% Language Arts DNM		% Writing Test DNM
	3rd	4th	5th	3rd	4th	5th	5th
JJH Elem	15	27	18	8	24	14	32

areas of greatest need for improvement are as follows: 62% of fourth grade students did NOT answer <u>Literary Comprehension</u> items correctly; 38% of fourth grade students did not answer <u>Reading Skills and Vocabulary</u> items correctly; and 49% of third-grade students did not answer <u>Reading for Information</u> items correctly. JJH's CRCT ELA Domain Analysis reveals that 36% of fifth graders did not answer <u>Grammar and Sentence Construction</u> items correctly, while 37% of fourth graders did not answer <u>Research and Writing Process</u> items correctly. On the state's 2011 Fifth Grade Writing Assessment, the percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding standards at JJH Elementary was 68%, a significant improvement over our writing scores from 2010 by 27%, but JJH is still well below the state meets/exceeds rate of 79%.

The results of the 2011 Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS) assessment reveals that for the JJH students' English/Language Arts mean score of 88.2% (student's meeting or exceeding standards) was slightly higher than the district's mean score of 83.6% and the state's mean score of 81.4%. JJH students scored significantly higher than the state's average of 76.3% and the district's average of 71.5% on Motivation to Learn with a mean score of 84.7%.

b. Norm Referenced Assessment Data (NRT)—Scantron Performance Series—SPR 2011:

JJH is well below national achievement levels in both reading and language arts according to norm-referenced assessments. All students in grades 2-5 are significantly below grade level

Table 2: NRT Data for Grades 2, 3, 4, and 5				
	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
JJH-Reading	42	32	31	23
JJH-Language	49	30	36	29

(< 50%ile) in both areas. The average reading percentile for all grades is 32, which is significant-ly below national achievement levels. The average reading percentile ranking for students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities are well below national achievement levels in reading in grades 3-5. (See Appendix A for NRT data.)

c. Disaggregation of Data in Subgroups: Although some grade levels improved slightly by decreasing the number of students who did NOT meet standards from 2010 to 2011, 4th grade

Table 3: Disaggregated 2011 CRCT Data for Grades 3, 4, and 5 – Did NOT Meet Standards							
		% Reading DNM			% Language Arts DNM		
	Grades	3	4	5	3	4	5
All Students	09-10	17	17	24	20	17	29
	10-11	15	27	18	16	24	14
Black Students	09-10	7	21	22	14	29	22
	10-11	20	11	16	20	12	24
Hispanic Students	09-10	20	13	27	22	13	32
	10-11	12	26	18	4	28	10
White Students	09-10	22	67	0	22	0	0
	10-11	25	1	50	0	40	0

ED	09-10	18	18	25	20	18	30
	10-11	16	27	16	9	27	11
SWD	09-10	63	50	13	75	50	50
	10-11	83	89	43	33	78	43
LEP	09-10	50	22	57	50	11	86
	10-11	23	40	14	41	25	30

Gifted	09-10	0	0	14	0	0	14
	10-11	0	0	0	0	0	0

students, in particular, increased the number of students NOT meeting standards in reading.
Fourth grade students with limited English proficiency and all students with disabilities, grades
2-5, are the subgroups that show an area of greatest concern.

d. Teacher Retention Data: Judia Jackson Harris has been open for three years. During our
first year, we had 38 teachers and a retention rate of 95%. The second year the school had 46
teachers and a retention rate of 91%. We are currently in our third year with 52 teachers. All
teachers who resigned left due to medical issues, moved out of state, or took a district promotion.

e. Teacher Participation in PLCs or On-Going Professional Learning at the School: All
teachers participate in professional learning communities on a weekly basis where teachers
unpack standards, develop common formative assessments, and discuss best instructional
practices. The professional learning communities enable teams to analyze grade-level and
classroom data to inform instruction. Teachers also participate in on-going professional learning
as outlined in School Improvement Plan documents. See Sections Xa and Xd.

XIV.	NEEDS ASSESSMENT

a. Description of the Materials Used in the Needs Assessment: The School Improvement
Leadership Team (SILT) & Literacy Teams used a variety of resources to identify school-wide
literacy needs for a Needs Assessment. We examined the grade level student scores in 2010
CRCT, NRT data, state writing assessments, Clarke County School District (CCSD) School
Improvement Survey, district literacy assessment results, quarterly benchmark assessments, and
our own school improvement plan. We conducted a faculty literacy survey as well as a
brainstorming session within the Literacy Team along with Clarke County's English Language

Arts Coach. The Team also examined the findings of the Students With Disabilities (SWD) data dig and root cause analysis conducted earlier in November.

b. **Description of the Needs Assessment Process:** The Team followed the district's process for identifying need by analyzing district and school level data. School data teams then met to participate in a root cause analysis activity. After examining student performance data on different measures, the School Improvement Leadership Team, grade level teams, and entire faculty engaged in conversations around areas of strengths and weaknesses. The conversations, combined with data from the school literacy survey, served as the impetus for the needs assessment. We also considered a comprehensive needs assessment that was conducted for the school's annual Title I addendum. All of these documents have shown a need for a comprehensive literacy plan and a focus on the teaching of reading/phonics. In addition, our conversations and survey data have shown a significant level of teacher awareness regarding a need for more instructional resources and professional learning (PL) in this area.

c. **Listing of Individuals Who Participated in the Needs Assessment:** <u>**SILT Team**</u> - Melissa Bastanpour (Grade K), Melissa Graham (Grade 1), Leslie Brown (Grade 2), Megan Nasrallah (Grade 4), Jessica Wilcox (Grade 5), Chris Vanderford (EIP), Abby Hughes (Gifted), Beverly Ford (SpEd), Denise Payne (Media Specialist), Marsha Thomas (Assistant Principal), Xernona Thomas (Principal), Melanie Bradberry (Instructional Coach), Sarah Heath (Grade 3), Barbara Hicks (ESOL), Katherine Brown (Gifted), Lew Allen (University of Georgia Professor-in-Residence) <u>**Literacy Team**</u>- Daphne Hall (ESOL), Kerstin Long (EIP), Melissa Graham (Grade 1), Beverly Ford (SpEd), Vanessa Ford (EIP), Marsha Thomas (Assistant Principal), Xernona Thomas (Principal), Melanie Bradberry (Instructional Coach), Apryl Patterson (Grade 5), Lew Allen (University of Georgia Professor-in-Residence)

XV.   AREAS OF CONCERN

a – c.   Clearly Identifies the Areas of Concern as They Relate to the Researched-based Practices Found in the "What" Document: There is no single systematic school-wide approach for the implementation of literacy instruction due to the fact that J. J. Harris Elementary Charter School was established in 2009. Because our faculty has come with various philosophies and approaches to literacy, we currently draw from a variety of methods and strategies to teach reading. In our first two years, we implemented new initiatives such as our Professional Development Schools partnership (PDS), School Wide Enrichment Model (SEM), and Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP). We intend to utilize the advantages of the UGA partnership, programs in progress (e.g. SEM, FLAP), and various experiences of teachers to implement a coordinated literacy plan using common language and developing common understandings.

Currently, we serve 533 students of which 69% are Hispanic, 24% African American, and 7% white. Many of our students enter kindergarten with limited English proficiency and without strong oral-language skills. Most of our students are emerging in reading and writing and need opportunities to develop alphabet knowledge, awareness of concept of print, writing as a means of communication, and use of writing tools. At JJH, our areas of greatest concern are language and literacy development. The Striving Readers grant would provide the opportunity to engage in professional learning that allows teachers to consider research-based best practices and characteristics of our student population to design a comprehensive reading plan. Additionally, we would purchase traditional and digital texts, instructional/assessment tools, and professional literature for teachers and families.

d.   Specific Age, Grade Levels, or Content Areas in Which the Concern Originates: The area of greatest concern originates in K-2 with the focus on literacy.

e. Areas of Concern and Details the Steps the School Has or Has Not Taken to Address the Problems:

Table 4: Areas of Concerns and Solutions		
Areas of Concern	**What JJH Has Done to Address the Problem**	**What JJH Has NOT Done to Address the Problem**

Common Understanding of Literacy Instruction
• Reading, specifically
   o Phonological Awareness
   o Phonics Instruction
• Writing for authentic purposes
	• K – Zoo Phonics Resource
	• Implementation of Voyager Passport for struggling readers
	• Professional Learning:
	• Four-Square Writing (as an organizational tool)
	• Writing Across Curriculum (science interactive notebooks)
		• K-2 needs literacy materials, such as *Dibels Next* and core reading program
		• More faculty training in content area writing

Professional Learning • Assessing for Literacy • Miscue Analysis • Next Steps for Teaching after analyzing assessment data	Professional learning in other areas: • Establishing charter, PDS with University of Georgia, School-wide Enrichment Model (SEM),Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP)	• No professional learning in the explicit instruction in the essential components of early reading • Administration of assessments used for placement • Using assessment results to drive instruction
Accessibility/Increased availability of reading material • Media collection • Additional book • Classroom libraries	• Ordered additional leveled readers	• Establish rich classroom libraries • Added an additional book room • Added additional books to media center collection

XVI.   ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

a. Root or Underlying Causes of the Areas of Concern Found in the Needs Assessment:

Because our faculty has come with various philosophies and approaches of literacy, we have not yet established a comprehensive plan for literacy instruction that incorporates the strengths of teachers' experiences and meets the needs of our student population. During our first year, we wrote and submitted a conversion charter petition and created a partnership with the University of Georgia as a Professional Development School (PDS). We worked diligently and collabor-atively to establish a positive school culture by implementing new routines and procedures, creating schedules, and promoting

initiatives such as our School Wide Enrichment Model (SEM). In our second year, we implemented a federal Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) grant, which focuses on dual language immersion via the science and social studies content. Most of the professional learning was in support of these initiatives. As a result of focusing on these efforts so heavily, very little professional learning has been done in the area of literacy instruction. As a new school, we are also in the process of increasing our collection of resources for students and teachers. Our school's collection of books and instructional resources needs to reflect a variety of genres, content areas, and cultures. We also recognize that intense, professional learning will be essential in helping us develop a comprehensive plan of literacy instruction at JJ Harris.

b. **Specific Grade Levels That Are Affected:** The literacy plan impacts grades K-5.

c. **Specific Rationale for the Determination of the Cause:** Most of our students enter school with both limited English proficiency and little academic language. In addition, 69% of our students speak Spanish as their first language, which has been identified as a barrier to their academic success. Furthermore, 99% of our student population is economically disadvantaged and not exposed to home environments that are print-rich, or have reading materials available to help establish or build upon fundamental skills for literacy. Teachers are challenged to overcome these obstacles and to promote early literacy for students, but need professional learning opportunities to improve their knowledge of teaching reading.

d. **What Has Been Done in the Past to Address the Problem:**

Table 5: What Has Been Done in the Past to Address the Problem	
Dates	**Professional Learning Activities**
August 4	Incorporating Process Skills in Clusters
August 5	Four Square Writing
August 16	Type II Process Skills/Marzano's Similarities and Differences
August 23-25	Jo Robinson's Student Engagement training
September 6	Depth of Knowledge/Bloom's Revised Taxonomy to develop assessments (DOK) 4th grade

September 21	CC-GPS Overview for 2011-2012
October 3	Foldables for Organizing Information & Science Interactive Notebooks — Writing Across the Curriculum
November 7	Vocabulary Strategies That Work—during planning periods
November 18	Data Dig/Fishbone with 5 Why's—SWD Teachers

e. **New Information the Needs Assessment Uncovered:** All faculty and staff were surveyed in November to determine the school needs for literacy instruction. The faculty survey concluded that professional learning to establish a single, comprehensive plan is an essential need to improve literacy instruction. Providing additional print and electronic resources was also seen as a necessary component to help students reach proficiency in literacy. Additional professional learning for integration of technology in instruction also emerged as an area of need.

XVII. SCHOOL LITERACY TEAM

a. **Listing of the Members of the School Literacy Team:** Xernona Thomas, Principal; Marsha Thomas, Assistant Principal; Melanie Bradberry, Instructional Coach; Daphne Hall, ESOL; Kerstin Long, EIP; Beverly Ford, Special Education; Vanessa Ford, Early Intervention Program; Melissa Graham, 1st Grade; Apryl Patterson, 5th Grade; Lew Allen, University of Georgia, Professor-in-Residence

b. **Function of the Site-Based Literacy Team in Terms of the Needs Assessment:** The Literacy Team was formed as a subgroup of our School Improvement Leadership Team (SILT). Teachers and administrators participated in discussions regarding literacy needs assessment and plans for addressing those needs. The Literacy Team polled faculty to identify challenges and areas of concern in regards to the development of a JJH Literacy Plan.

c. **Minutes of the Meeting of the School Site Based Literacy Team:** See Appendix G.

d. **How did the Literacy Team Communicate and Include All Members of the Staff in the Decision-Making Process:** The site based literacy team communicated by holding regularly

scheduled meetings with SILT, entire faculty, as well as meeting with grade level teams. The

faculty received and responded to a literacy needs assessment to reflect on student literacy needs.

The decisions necessary to move the grant forward will be communicated to the faculty by the

site based literacy team through school wide faculty meetings and grade level team meetings or

email. Soliciting input from the entire faculty will build staff buy-in for the grant itself, while

keeping grant goals and objectives in the forefront of everyone's mind.

VI.   PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

a & b. A clear list of project goals and objectives that relate to implementing the goals

identified:

Goal 1-To develop a school-wide comprehensive plan for literacy instruction, K-5
- Implement a systematic, sequenced program for literacy instruction, K-2
- Implement an integrated approach to reading and writing including writing across the content areas, Grades 3-5.

Goal 2-To provide high quality PL on literacy instruction and assessment
- Provide professional learning on systematic phonemic awareness/phonics instruction, effective writing instruction

- Provide professional learning on literacy assessment, miscue analysis, and analyzing student Data

Goal 3-To increase the availability of print and digital reading materials in our media center, leveled book room, and individual classrooms
- Increase family engagement by utilizing resources for Family Literacy Night, FACT, and share in family resource center

c.   The research-based practices in the "What and Why" document as a guide for

establishing goals and objectives:

Table 6: Research-based Practices

Building Blocks of Literacy Plan	Activities
1. Standards	Unpack CCGPS standards in grades K-5
2. Components Unique to Birth-5	See Early Learning Proposal for CCSD.
3. Ongoing formative and sum-mative assessments	Provide training and support for best practices in instruc-tion and assessment in reading
4. Response to Intervention	Continue providing current interventions for students not yet meeting

	standards *(already funded)*
5. Best Practices in Instruction	Continue School-wide Enrichment Model, bilingual instruction in Science and Social Studies *(already funded)*
6. High Quality Teachers	Provide professional learning on research-based best practices for teaching reading and writing
7. Engaged Leadership	Continue providing family engagement events (e.g. Principal's Coffee); continue Data Team process; SILT; provide new resources to family resource center
8. Clearly articulated plan for transitions and alignment	Continue Data Team process and using district curriculum pacing guide
9. Intentional strategies for maintaining engagement	Continue strategies from previous professional learning on student engagement; provide new reading and instructional materials

d. Considers practice already in place when determining goals and objectives: Note

strategies in Table 6 above. Those practices already in place will be continued. Best practices for

teaching will be enhanced by a new focus on reading and writing. Professional learning related to

literacy will provide teachers with the tools to better assess progress in reading and writing.

Analysis of students' progress in data teams will lead to more focused instruction.

e. Goals to be funded with other sources: Several current practices will continue and are

previously funded (e.g. SEM, FLAP, and interventions for RTI).

VII. SCIENTIFIC, EVIDENCE-BASED LITERACY PLAN

**a-c. Plan to Implement the Goals and Objectives Identified; Who Will Implement; What

Will Take Place Based on the "What" Document: Goal 1**-To develop a schoolwide compre-

hendsive plan for literacy instruction; **Goal 2**-To provide high quality, professional learning on

literacy instruction and assessment; **Goal 3**-To increase the availability of print and digital

reading materials in our media center, leveled book room, and individual classrooms. The leader-

ship for the plan will be provided by the principal, Literacy Team, and School Improvement

Leadership Team and implemented by the entire school faculty in partnership with the Univer-

sity of Georgia (PDS). The services of consultants, district leaders, experts, UGA professors,

and the instructional coach will be utilized to support the pro-fessional learning of the faculty**.**

The Literacy Team and literacy consultants will work with grade levels to develop and implement a comprehensive school-wide literacy plan. Our plan will include providing professional learning on scientifically researched-based practices that include systematic and explicit reading and writing instruction (Best Practices in Instruction, "What", p. 6). Many of our students have limited exposure to text-based experiences due to high poverty, limited access to public resources, and low proficiency in English as a second language. Pro-fessional learning will ensure our teachers are prepared to provide students with experiences in direct compre-hension instruction, self-directed learning, text-based collaborative learning, and with practicing ongoing formative and summative assessments (Assessment, "What", p. 12). Additionally, professional learning will include training for faculty to provide opportunities for students with strategic tutoring, reading diverse texts, writing across content, and using integrated technology (High Quality Teachers, "What", p. 17). We will increase the availability of print and digital reading materials in our school's media center, leveled book room, and individual classrooms (Intentional Strategies for Student Engagement, "What," p. 19).

d. Details the Current Instructional Schedule: See Appendix B.

e. Details a Plan for Tiered Instruction

Tier I: Tier I instruction takes place in the regular education classroom. Whole group, small group, and collaborative instruction are used to deliver lessons in a research-based format: opening/activating strategy, mini-lesson, work session, and summarizing activity. ELT is used to re-teach students based on formative and summative assessments.
Tier II: Tier II instruction includes EIP teacher intervention in flexible grouping based on assessments and student progress. Regular education classroom teachers may provide modified assignments for targeted skill/standard-based instruction (e,g., Renzulli website, intervention resources from textbooks/computer programs, differentiated strategies in the content areas).
Tier III: Students not responding to Tiers I and II instruction are evaluated for the need to receive additional learning support through direct instruction or collaborative instruction with SPED teachers. JJH has 4 SPED teachers that work with students at this tier. Gifted teachers also provide differentiated learning to students by utilizing Renzulli's Type III (advanced) projects.
Tier IV: SPED, ESOL, and GIFTED teachers work with classroom teachers to provide learning support to all students receiving instruction at this level.

f. Details the Materials Currently Used for Tier 1 Instruction: See Section VIIIa.

g. Lists the Time, Personnel and Strategies for Tier II, III, and IV Instruction: Grades K – 2 receive 45 minutes of instruction for intervention and grades 3 – 5 receive 50 minutes of instruction for intervention. Instruction is provided by Special Education, ELL, EIP, UGA student teachers, Pathways to Success after-school Program (PSP) teachers, and general education teachers. The following technology resources and strategies are used for intervention: Successmaker 3, Voyager Passport, Fast ForWord, PSP, and small group instruction during ELT.

h. Includes a Statement Regarding Conflict with Other Initiatives: This does not conflict with other initiatives that are already established.

VIII. STRATEGIES AND MATERIALS (EXISTING AND PROPOSED) INCLUDING TECHNOLOGY TO SUPPORT THE LITERACY PLAN

a. General List of Current Classroom Resources for Each Classroom in the School:

SMART- Board and projectors in each classroom; classroom desktop computers (2-4 per class-room); Storytown Materials, grades 3-5; Rigby Series Big Books; Rigby Word Works; Text Talk, grades K-2; Writers' Express, grades 3-5; Wonder Writers, K-2; Fountas and Pinnell resources

b. Generic List of Shared Resources: Computer lab; laptop carts; iPod Touches—3 in media center—use for camera, video, apps, peer observations; flip cameras—4 in media center; Zoo Phonics; leveled reader book room; Storytown Strategic Intervention; Voyager Passport Reading; small professional learning library; document cameras—2 in media center; SMART Response system—3 sets; digital cameras—7 in media center **Software:** SOLO 6 Literacy Suite; Renzulli Learning; Nettrekker; Destiny - library search, web path express; Galileo - Internet search; Rosetta Stone; ThinkCentral; SuccessMaker; FastForWord; Voyager - Ticket to Read; BrainPop

c. General List of Library Resources or a Description of the Library as Equipped and other shared resources: The school Literacy Team will also assist the Media Specialist in designing a reading incentive program that promotes a culture of literacy within the school ("Why" document, p. 33). In order to bring our media center's circulation to proficiency status, we are required to have an inventory for student checkout at an average of 15 books per student and would need to purchase an additional 269 books with a reading range up to 13 years of age. In order to meet the exemplary status, 20 books per student are required, and our school would need to purchase an additional 2,944 books. Of the approximately 7756 books in our media center, the genre of books included within our collection are as follows: 3672 nonfiction, 1140 fiction, 1601 easy fiction, 132 Professional, 382 Reference, 344 Spanish, 10 Story Collection, 475 Biography.

d. List of Resources Needed to Implement Literacy Plan Including Student Engagement:

Funding for consultants, conferences; media center availability during the summer; stipends for professional leanning, substitutes for professional learning days and teacher collaboration; media center materials; classroom libraries, professional learning materials, technology devices, such as handhelds, software and hardware to support technology devices, assessments and protocol materials; content area reading materials; professional learning libraries; individual PL libraries; informal Reading Inventory, such as Scholastic Reading Inventory; leveled book room materials; bilingual texts and resources; subscriptions to periodic and online resources; phonics and spelling resources

e. Generic List of Activities That Support Classroom Practices: Core reading program (K-2); systematic phonics instruction; direct vocabulary instruction; spiral reviews; five components of effective reading instruction; direct explicit comprehension instruction; making connections

while reading; use of technology (Skype sessions, DVDs, streaming, reading goal tracking); school library collection of books that would average; fieldtrips

f. Generic List of Activities That Support Literacy Intervention Programs: Fountas and Pinnell Activities; ZooPhonics for ELL for Kindergarten; Storytown Intervention and ELL resources; SuccessMaker; guided reading instruction in small group or with individual

g. Generic List of Additional Strategies Needed to Support Student Success: On-going professional learning; effective Reading Comprehension Strategies; School-wide Enrichment Model-Reading Framework; text-structure instruction; establishing an engaging and motivating context in which to teach reading; strategies for teaching vocabulary; vertical conversations to support all readers

IX.   PROJECT PROCEDURES AND SUPPORT

a. Details a Sample Schedule by Grade Level Indicating a Tiered Instructional Schedule

Tier I: Tier I instruction takes place in the regular education classroom. Whole group, small, and collaborative instruction models are used to deliver lessons in a research-based format: opening/activating strategy, mini-lesson, work session, and summarizing activity. ELT is used to re-teach students based on formative and summative assessments. Through the Striving Readers Grant, teachers will utilize new tools that will yield more accurate formative and summative assessment of students' performance in reading and writing (Assessment, "What", p. 12). Teachers will have new resources including books and digital texts that will increase student engagement ("Intentional Strategies for Student Engagement," "What," p. 19). Also, there will be a 30-minute increase of time in the ELA blocks (Best Practices, "What", p. 15).
Tier II: Tier II instruction includes EIP teacher intervention in flexible grouping based on assessments and student progress. Regular education classroom teachers may provide modified assignments for targeted skill/standard-based instruction (ex. Renzulli website, intervention resources from textbooks/ computer programs, differentiated strategies in the content areas). Students have the opportunity to participate in academic after school programs. With the Striving Readers Grant, differentiation by grouping will be more accurate. Teachers will provide opportunities for students with strategic tutoring, reading diverse texts, writing across content, and using integrated technology ("High Quality Teachers," "What," p. 17). Parents and students will have access to additional reading materials and learn about best practices in parent involvement ("Engaged Leadership," "What", p. 17).
Tier III: Students not responding to Tier I and II instruction are evaluated for the need to receive additional learning support through direct instruction or collaborative instruction with SPED teachers. JJH has 4 SPED teachers that work with students at this tier. Gifted teachers also provide differentiated learning to students by utilizing Type III projects. With the Striving Readers Grant, teachers will group students more accurately based on assessment data ("Four Tiered Instruction Model," "What," p. 15).

Resource teachers will use best practices after analyzing new student data and provide better targeted instruction for skills and standard-based tasks.
Tier IV: SPED, ESOL, and GIFTED teachers work with classroom teachers to provide learning support to all students receiving instruction at this level. With the Striving Readers Grant, teachers will have new resources including books and digital texts that will increase student engagement ("Intentional Strategies for Student Engagement," "What," p. 19).

b. Shows that Students in Elementary Will Receive at Least 90 Minutes of Tiered

Instruction and Middle/High School 2-4 Hours through the Content Areas: See Appx. C.

c. Shows a Schedule That Is Designed for RTI: See Appendix C and Section IX a.

X. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED
ON THE BASIS OF DOCUMENTED NEEDS

g. Table Indicating the Professional Learning Activities That Staff Have Attended in the Past Year:

Table 7: Professional Learning Activities 2011
New Teacher Orientation—CCSD & JJH
Data Team Training for SILT Members--CCSD
Type II Process Skills/Differentiation
Mind-Set De-escalation Training
Incorporating Type III Process Skills in Clusters
Four Square Writing
Type II Process Skills/Marzano's Similarities and Differences
Jo Robinson's Student Engagement training
Data Team Training for Leaders
Data Team Training for Leaders with Mike White
Cognitively Guided Instruction for Math (CGI) K-5
Depth of Knowledge/Bloom's Revised Taxonomy
TJ Kopcha—Complex Fraction Concepts
Student Efficacy
CC-GPS Overview
Writing Across the Curriculum—Science Interactive Notebooks
Success Maker
Voyager Math & Voyager PassPort (Reading)
Effective Strategies for Teaching Science
UGA Science Centers
Vocabulary Strategies
GAPSS—What to Expect
Data Dig/Fishbone & 5 Why's with SWD teachers
Integrating Creativity Lessons with Dr. Hébert

b. Number of Hours of Professional Learning That Staff Have Attended: During the 2011 - 2012 school year to date, 65 staff members participated in approximately 100 hours of school-provided professional learning. Of those, 10 hours of the sessions were literacy related.

c. The Percentage of Staff Attending Professional Learning: 100% of JJH certified faculty members participate in professional learning. If a teacher misses a scheduled session, the teacher team members or instructional coach redeliver the material.

d. Detailed List of On-Going Professional Learning: School Improvement Planning process; Assessment for Literacy (Diagnostic, Formative, and Summative); Writing Across the Curriculum; Reading Across the Curriculum; Common Core GPS; Student Efficacy; Vocabulary Strategies; Phonics & Phonemic Awareness; Collaborative Planning; Differentiated PL based on teacher needs to support teacher efficacy

e. Preferred Method of Delivery of Professional Learning: Our professional learning delivery methods are whole group, small group, and teacher choice.

f. Programmatic Professional Learning Needs Identified in the Needs Assessment: Based upon our survey and Literacy Team discussions, we need the following in the area of professional development: Miscue Analysis; phonics & phonemic awareness; reading assessments; implementation and next steps for instruction; technology component of literacy integration; professional development follow-up with coaching ("Why," p. 142)

XI.   ASSESSMENT/DATA ANALYSIS PLAN

a. Detailed Listing of the School's Current Assessment Protocol: See Appendix D.

h. Explanation of the Current Data Analysis Protocol: Before school begins each year, the JJH School Improvement Leadership Team attends the Clarke County School District school improvement planning workshop. The SILT conducts a comprehensive needs assessment for all

subject areas based upon the previous year's data from CRCT, NRT, local benchmark results, parents and teacher surveys. Overall grade level performances are analyzed as well as sub-groups' data. Root causes are determined and the school improvement plan is developed based on our needs assessment. A professional learning plan and calendar are outlined and prioritized for the upcoming year. During the school year, grade level teams meet each week to discuss individual student performance. Those days are designated for data team discussions, or Talking about Teaching and Learning (TATAL). Student assessment data is recorded in electronic templates as grade level teams to see how students are performing on common diagnostic assessments or pretests, determining how to proceed with planning for instruction, preparing common formative and summative assessments, and using post-test results in determining which students need remediation or acceleration. Teachers use this time as well to discuss and document students' needs in Response to Intervention tiers. Flexible groups are determined for Extended Learning Time remediation and acceleration. Differentiated instruction is then planned for these groups, and the process begins again. District-wide diagnostic classroom assessments are routinely administered to students in grades 1-5 to measure student growth in the areas of writing, reading comprehension, reading fluency, math computation, and math fluency. Each assessment has target scores for every quarter in order to assess if students are progressing in that area.

J.J. Harris works in conjunction with the Division of Instructional Services & School Performance to conduct an Implementation & Impact Check of its school improvement plan during January or February and again in May. The Annual Performance Report, data reports and technical assistance, and the Implementation & Impact Check serve as the major components of our district's internal quality assurance review. This internal quality assurance review is a requirement of the SACS district accreditation process. The results of the school performance report is shared with the school staff, parents, and the Board of Education at the beginning of the school year via Annual Title I meetings,

school council meetings, or other methods. During these meetings, feedback is sought from parents on instructional priorities for the school.

i. Comparison of the Current Protocol with the Striving Readers Assessment Plan: The current assessment protocol gives a picture quarterly compared to the Striving Readers Assessment Plan, which would allow for more formative assessment and frequent opportunities for progress monitoring all throughout the year.

j. How the New Assessments Will Be Implemented into the Current Assessment Schedule: Our school's current assessment plan mirrors the district's literacy assessment plan and protocol as outlined and detailed above (sections a and b). We will need to add a universal screener component to literacy assessment, such as *DIBELS Next*. The screener will be administered three times per year to students in grades K-5. The *DIBELS Next Progress Monitoring Assessments* will be administered to students who are identified as struggling on the Benchmark Assessments. This additional component will offer further information to inform instruction and gauge the effectiveness of interventions. In addition to the current assessment protocol, assessments to measure fluency and informal reading inventories will be administered quarterly and ongoing as needed. All key personnel will participate in *on-going* professional development for proficient administration and scoring of all components of these instruments.

k. Listing Current Assessments That Might Be Discontinued as a Result of the Implementation of Striving Readers: The district's reading fluency and reading level assess-ments may be replaced with those of a comprehensive literacy assessment instrument, such as *DIBELS Next*.

l. Listing of Training That Teachers Will Need to Implement Any New Assessments: Literacy assessment administration; literacy assessment scoring; technology components of new assessments; miscue analysis; scoring of writing

m. How Data Is Presented to Parents and Stakeholders: Disaggregated test data results are reported to the public through our local newspaper, *The Athens Banner Herald*, district and school websites, newsletters sent to parents, and the school marquee. Detailed data summits are also provided to our teachers during faculty meetings and to parents during our annual Title I meeting and our school's Governance Board. Information is also available in our parent center located in our Family Engagement Room. Parents are made aware of the information in the engagement room through the newsletter and in parent meetings. Performance data is also sent to parents via the school listserv and is provided to the community through UGA and service organization presentations. Profile sheets with perform-ance data are available in the front office of the school for all visitors.

XII.   RESOURCES

e. Clear Alignment Plan for Striving Readers and All Other Funding: See Appendix E.

f. List of the Resources Available in the Building: Title VIB supports the development of a positive school climate; breakfast, lunch, and afternoon snack to children who qualify for free and reduced meals; Head Start and Early Head Start offer early learning programs and adult literacy programming for families that qualify; GED and ESOL adult education; Foreign Language grant. Also see Appendix F.

g. Plan to Ensure That No Supplanting Takes Place: The site based Literacy Team is developing an implementation plan that supports existing programs, but that does not supplant those services, except as allowed by federal Striving Readers regulations. Title I funds are currently used to support the remediation/acceleration needs of students. Funds from Striving Readers will support additional program needs that have been identified by our needs assess-

ment. The school administration will also ensure that the funds from Striving Readers will supplement funds from other programs and provide additional supports for students.

h. Detail How Striving Readers Will Add Value to the Existing Resources in the Schools:

The Striving Readers grant will allow us to expand our learning communities to offer high quality, intense professional learning in the area of literacy. This grant will also allow us to expand our print and electronic media inventory to increase reading and writing opportunities for all students. In addition, funds will help to provide students will field experiences which will increase their academic background knowledge. The development of a global understanding of literacy instruction will provide the necessary framework to guide our work in this area.

Norm Referenced Assessment Data (NRT)—Scantron Performance Series—SPR 2011

Table 3: Disaggregated 2011 Scantron Performance Series (NRT)								
	Reading				Language Arts			
Grades	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
All Students	1903 B	2138 B	2355 B	2431 B	2049 B	2182 B	2360 B	2388 WB
Black Students	1844 B	2259 B	2361 B	2523 B	2006 B	2230 B	2303 B	2465 B
Hispanic Students	1895 B	2122 B	2342 B	2404 B	2035 A	2197 B	2375 B	2363 WB
White Students	2033 A	1939 WB	2496 A	2195 WB	2123 A	1939 WB	2428 B	2292 WB
SWD	1900 B	2114 B	2051 WB	2225 WB	1980 B	2170 B	2173 WB	2201 WB
LEP	1831 B	1945 WB	2130 WB	2194 WB	1989 B	2090 B	2266 B	2275 WB
Gifted	2301 A	2459 A	2693 AA	2912 AA	2289 AA	2398 A	2547 A	2559 B

AA= Above Average   A = Average   B= Below Average   WB = Well Below Average

Details the Current Instructional Schedule

	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
	Judia Jackson Harris Master Schedule					
7:40-7:55	**Announcements/Morning Meeting**					
7:55-8:45	**ELT**	**Math**	**Reading**	**Reading**	**Special Area 8:00-8:45**	**Sci./S.S.**
8:45-9:35	**Language Arts**	**Math**	**Language Arts**	**Language Arts**	**Sci./S.S.**	**Special Area 8:50-9:35**
9:35-10:25	**Reading**	**Sci./S.S.**	**Special Area 9:40-10:25**	**Math**	**Reading**	**Reading**
10:25-11:15	**Math**	**Lunch/Recess**	**Sci./S.S.**	**Math**	**Language Arts**	**Language Arts**
11:15-12:05	**Lunch/Recess**	**Language Arts**	**Lunch/Recess**	**Special Area 11:15-12:00**	**Math**	**Math**
12:05-12:55	**Special Area 12:25-12:55**	**Language Arts**	**Math**	**Lunch/Recess**	**Lunch/Recess**	**Math**
12:55-1:45	**Math**	**Special Area 1:00-1:45**	**Math**	**Sci./S.S.**	**Math**	**Lunch/Recess**
1:45-2:35	**Sci./S.S.**	**ELT**	**ELT**	**ELT**	**ELT**	**ELT**
2:35-3:30	After School Programs/Tier 2 Tier 3 Instruction					

Details a Sample Schedule by Grade Level Indicating a Tiered Instructional Schedule, 90 Minutes of Tiered Instruction, & Designed for Response to Intervention

	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
	Judia Jackson Harris Master Schedule					
7:40-7:55	**Announcements/Morning Meeting**					
7:55-8:45	ELT	Math	ELA	ELA	**Special Area 8:00-8:45**	Sci./S.S.
8:45-9:35	ELA	Math	ELA	ELA	Sci./S.S.	**Special Area 8:50-9:35**
9:35-10:25	ELA	Sci./S.S.	**Special Area 9:40-10:25**	Math	ELA	ELA
10:25-11:15	Math	Lunch/Recess	Sci./S.S.	Math	ELA	ELA
11:15-12:05	Lunch/Recess	ELA	Lunch/Recess	**Special Area 11:15-12:00**	Math	Math
12:05-12:55	**Special Area 12:25-12:55**	ELA	Math	Lunch/Recess	Lunch/Recess	Math
12:55-1:45	Math	**Special Area 1:00-1:45**	Math	Sci./S.S.	Math	Lunch/Recess
1:45-2:35	Sci./S.S.	ELT	ELT	ELT	ELT	ELT
	2:35-3:30 After School Programs/Tier 2 Tier 3 Instruction					

Detailed Listing of the School's Current Assessment Protocol

Assessment	Administration Dates
• Scored Writing Samples: Grades K-2	August 8-19
• Norm-referenced Assessments - Grades 2-5: Reading, Language Arts, Math	August 22-September 9
• Reading fluency, Math fluency, Diagnostic math assessments (Grades 1-5)	August 8-19
• 1st Quarter Literacy Assessments: Reading Level (grades K-5), Sight Vocabulary (Grades 1-2), Scored Writing Samples (Grades 3-5), Math Performance Tasks (Grades 3-5)	September 26-October
• Benchmark Assessments First Quarter – Grades 3-5: ELA & Math	October 5 - October 11
• GKIDS Assessment Period One Ends – Grade K	October 10
• 2nd Quarter Literacy Assessments: Reading Level (grades K-9), Sight Vocabulary (Grades 1-2), Spelling inventory (Grades 1-2), Scored Writing Samples (Grades 3-5), Reading & Math Fluency (Grades 1-8), Math Performance Tasks (Grades 3-5)	November 28- December 16
• Benchmark Assessment Second Quarter - Grades 1-5: ELA & Math	December 12-16
• GKIDS Collection Period Two Ends - Grade K	December 15
• Benchmark Assessment Third Quarter - Grades 3-5: ELA & Math	February 29 - March 6
• Writing Test – Grade 5	March 7 *(Make-up March 8)*
• 3rd Quarter Literacy Assessments: Reading Level (grades K-5), Sight Vocabulary, Spelling Inventory (Grades 1-2), Scored Writing Samples (Grades K, 3-5), Math Performance Tasks (Grades 3-5)	March 5-March 23
• GKIDS Assessment Period Three Ends - Grade K	March 19
• Writing Test Evaluations- Grade 3 (completed by grade 3 teachers)	March 19 - 30
• CRCT/CRCT-M - Grades 3-8	April 17-April 27*(Make-ups April 20,23,26 & 27)*

• 4th Quarter Literacy Assessments: Reading Level (grades K-5), Sight Vocabulary (Grades 1-2), Spelling inventory (Grades 1-2), Scored Writing Samples (Grades 3-5), Reading & Math Fluency (Grades 1-5), Math Performance Tasks (Grades 3-5)	April 23-May 16
• Comprehensive Benchmark Assessments - Grades 1-2: ELA & Math.	April 23-May 4
• GKIDS Final Assessments Completed and Submitted Online to GCA	May 11
• CRCT Grades 3 and 5 (retest)	May 20-21

Clear Alignment Plan for Striving Readers and All Other Funding

	Striving Readers Funding	Other Funding Sources
Professional Learning	Stipends for off contract professional learning, consultants, technology integration, student motivation and engagement strategies, best practices in reading and writing	Title II, Part A; Title I, Part A; GA Staff Development Funds; QBE; Title III (ESL); Title VI, Part B; IDEA Pre-School
Print Materials	Additional books for classroom libraries and Media Center; Professional books for book studies; Periodical or Online subscriptions for teacher learning	Early Reading First (ERF); Title I, Part A
Tier I Literacy Materials	Materials that provide lessons and strategies for the foundational literacy component	ERF; Early Intervention Program (EIP); QBE; Extended-Year;
Tier II Literacy Materials	Materials that support teachers' differentiating lessons based on Tier II needs	ERF; EIP/REP
Tier III Literacy Materials	Materials that provide focused, intense remediation and /or acceleration	ERF;EIP/REP
Tier IV Literacy Materials	Materials focused on enrichment and/or intense remediation	ERF;EIP/REP

Literacy Assessment Protocol	Comprehensive Literacy Assessment comprised of screener, diagnostic and progress monitoring	EIP/REP; Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title II, Part D; Title III; Title VI, Part B; IDEA, Part B (SWDs); IDEA Pre-School (SWDs)
Instructional Technology	Handheld devices, software, hardware that support literacy learning	Title II, Part D; SPLOST IV
Parent/Family Engagement	Parent Literacy, GED and child care; books for family library, hand-held devices, staff for extended library hours, Striving Readers updates to parents/families via website, Channel 16 (school district TV channel), school newsletters, newspaper articles	QBE; Title I, Part A; Title III; Title IV, Part B, IDEA, Part B (SWDs)

Appendix F

List of the Resources Available at Each Building

Funding Source	Program	School Use
Federal	Title I	1. Purchase instructional materials/supplies/programs 2. Staff development materials/supplies/presenters 3. Field trips 4. Parent meetings, incentives, Family Engagement Specialist, conferences, etc. 5. Hire Support teachers 6. Tutoring Programs Provides foreign language instruction for students in grades K-5
	FLAP	Used to provide daily nutritional snacks to help students stay focused on learning
	Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program Grant	
State	School Nutrition	1. Students receive free/reduced lunch & breakfast 2. Waivers for summer camp fees 3. Waivers for summer school fees 4. After school snacks 1. EIP Models reduce the student/teacher ratio in classrooms Hearing & Vision Screenings
	Early Intervention Program	

		Free dental services
	Health Care	Services through Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS)
	Help-A-Child Smile	
	American Scores	After school tutorial and recreation programs
	Safe & Drug Free Program	
Local	Grants	Lowes' Foundation Grant
	School Partners	School Supplies
		Uniforms
		Volunteers

Appendix G

Minutes of the Meeting of the School Site-Based Literacy Team

Striving Readers Grant Meeting

November 30, 2011

- ❖ Build on current practices and take to the next level
- ❖ Dibels – is there a comprehension component for upper grades – website shows yes.
- ❖ Uniformity/consistency of how people assess student skills

- ❖ Should we use Sweep assessors to conduct assessments at beginning of the year
- ❖ Leveling – good fit books – high interest, low level readers
- ❖ Miscue analysis – **Professional Learning** need
- ❖ Phonics – global weakness – applying to decoding strategies – huge **Professional Learning** need. Structured, sequential **program** that addresses phonics – Fountas & Pinnell. Need a program and need training of what we already have.
- ❖ Possibility of Saxon Phonics – K-2
- ❖ Strategic Readers – five handy helpers – **Professional Learning** – not just about calling words, but making meaning of text
- ❖ Classroom libraries, additional bookroom, reading series
- ❖ Use of Lexile scores for book leveling
- ❖ Possible trainers: Peg Gwyther, Jo Robinson, Kathy Ganske, Jo Beth Allen, Stephanie Jones
- ❖ Look at non-fiction books
- ❖ Importance of consistency in language, Harris Way of literacy. K-5 PL on above items, K-2 program for teaching phonics
- ❖ Arrange our school day to support literacy – look at master schedule
- ❖ Building connections between literacy and numeracy. Focus on literacy will improve math
- ❖ Could add reading endorsement as part of grant
- ❖ Phonics program, reading philosophy
- ❖ Primary needs: phonemic awareness and phonics, fluency, strategic reading, balanced literacy plan (due to being a new school there has not been a clear way of how we teach reading established, additionally there have been many other initiatives), increased availability of reading material for students (media, school bookroom and class libraries
- ❖ Primary professional learning needs: miscue analysis (fluency, vocabulary, comprehension), teaching phonics

Literacy Team

Professional Learning

12/01/11

- Small chunks, 4-5 week to try it (embedded)
- Viewing student work with protocols and knowing what to do next
- Team practice – how does that affect student learning?
- Safe group learning
- Literacy component in data teams (TATAL)
- -- common assessments
- --building connections between literacy and numeracy
- Miscue Analysis (how-to in date teams? Running records for teacher use, not reporting)
- Phonics Instruction
- Teaching kids to be strategic readers
- K-5 common language referring to literacy school-wide (Literacy Plan), (The JJ-way of teaching/literacy) – philosophy, approach, program art, science, what to call it?
- Scheduling needs to support master schedule and PL schedule
- PL follow-up (science notebooks, foldables, vocabulary strategies, Marzano, etc.) with little time to implement – people to go to, - video snippits, - how to (technology) – evaluation of teacher growth